

THE
CROZER QUARTERLY

JULY, 1927

ISSUED BY THE

Faculty of Crozer Theological Seminary

EDWARD B. POLLARD, *Managing Editor*
RITTENHOUSE NEISSER, *Business Manager*

CONTENTS

	PAGE
WANTED: A "NEW HUMANISM." Woodman Bradbury	251
THE GOSPEL WITHIN THE GOSPEL. Albert G. Lawson	268
THE DOCTRINE OF SALVATION. Spenser B. Meeser	281
A FORMULA FOR CHURCH UNION. John M. Moore	301
WHITHER BOUND IN MISSIONS? Henry C. Vedder	311
ARCHÆOLOGICAL AND CRITICAL NOTES	
WHERE THE DINOSAUR HID ITS EGGS	321
FURTHER MISINTERPRETATIONS OF FAMILIAR PASSAGES	323
NOTES AND CURRENT DISCUSSIONS	331
WHAT'S WHAT IN THE MAGAZINES	
OUR NEGLECT OF PSYCHOLOGY	337
ROMAN CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT IN CHINA	338
RESEARCH METHODS IN RELIGIOUS WORK	341
LET RELIGIOUS EDUCATION BEWARE!	344
THE ENDING OF MARK'S GOSPEL	346
WHO'S WHO IN THIS ISSUE	347
BOOK REVIEWS	349

Printed for CROZER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY by
THE JUDSON PRESS, PHILADELPHIA

Price, 40 cents. Annual Subscription, \$1.50, post free

THE CROZER QUARTERLY

Entered as second-class matter, December 21, 1923, at the post-office at Chester, Pa., under Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized December 21, 1923.

Copyright, July, 1927, by Crozer Theological Seminary.

Vol. IV

JULY, 1927

No. 3

WANTED: A "NEW HUMANISM"

Professor WOODMAN BRADBURY

Newton Theological Institution, Newton Center, Mass.

WE students of the theory and practise of public religious services are becoming sensitive to the challenges which come from many directions. We have for years felt in a slight way the challenge implicit in the stock jokes of the stage and the humorous quips of the press anent the futility of the church offices. It has lately become common for editors of popular magazines to run series of questionnaires on such topics as: "Why is the business man ceasing to support the church except as a flying buttress—from the outside?" "What can the church offer the intellectual man or woman?" "Boys, why attend college chapel?" "Ladies, why prefer church meetings to concerts or clubs?" Far more disturbing though less noisy are the stings of statistics—empty pews, closed churches, diminishing returns.

We have not remained unmoved by these challenges. But our individual efforts have been hardly more than Canute-like gestures before the rising tide of popular indifference to church services. We have tried to win out by alluring advertisements, spectacular signs, "hurrah-boy" rallies, sensational entertainments, prize competitions. Have we not made frantic use of

our whole outfit of trumpets and banners? We have also resorted to more serious and thoughtful experiments. For the sake of the "tired business man," we have sacrificed our pride in pulpit pyrotechnics by making our sermons shorter and yet shorter. We have yielded to the demands of blasé amusement-tasters by "enriching" our musical services and brightening our pageantry of worship. In despair of winning this generation, we have made practical application of Oliver Wendell Holmes' famous advice and sought to create a future generation of church-goers by training their grandparents-to-be; that is, we have concentrated on the religious education of youth.

And yet those unpalatable facts remain, those drooping curves in our church charts. Our critics seem to be already sharpening their pencils for the obituary headlines. Their noisy preparations make us nervous and develop a fear-complex. But funeral orations and requiems are premature. The church's illness is not unto death. The way to returning health and vigorous usefulness is already discerned by progressive religious thinkers. The diagnosis and the cure are appearing in recent books and monographs. Cooperative effort will surely put us on the road to health. In this hope I offer my bit toward a study which I trust will be increasingly general.

The hopeful feature in the situation is that it is not religion, but the organized practise of religion, which is challenged. The church services are the vulnerable point. People are asking, Do we longer need public, cooperative worship? Cannot a man have a more satisfying religious experience in solitude than as a member of a congregation? Is not the service with others indoors less stimulating religiously than by oneself in the temple of Nature, under Heaven's own dome, with winds and waves to bear his prayers toward the Infinite and the birds to sing a liturgy? Every pastor will recognize the familiar poesy. Such outbursts of eloquence often come from our stay-away-from-church Christians, but we can detect evi-

dences of pernicious anemia even in their devotions. Fellowship is needed. Highest religious states arise from cooperative effort God-ward. Our psychological sociologists like Trotter and MacDougall assert that man is a social animal and functions best in groups. The centripetal force holding together fraternal orders, socialist and Utopian societies, and the like is more than fellowship: it is some common ideal which finds expression in common customs and practises, amounting in some cases to quasi-religious rites.

If men still acknowledge their need of religion, and if in actual experience it is proved that tribal and communal psychology still holds us to cooperative undertakings, what is the cause of the increasing abandonment of organized public worship? In some way our church services fail to meet any religious demand, our public worship does not seem to possess any real value for religious experience. The situation calls for investigation.

What are the religious needs to be fulfilled in public worship? What are the religious values which a satisfying public worship must have? They are two. Do not all religious practises in all history show that the fundamental needs which worship is designed to meet are, first, the need of mystic communion with God and, secondly, the need of some direct vocal instruction from Heaven? The priest and the prophet are found in all religions. The priest is the mediator who brings men into God's presence for intimate communion. The prophet is the spokesman for God revealing to men amid their uncertainties and adventures the real *summum bonum* of living. All worship, past and present, pagan and Christian, is based upon these two complementary needs. In Christian churches, the priestly and prophetic are in one man; liturgies and sacraments minister to the need for a means of communion with God, and the preaching ministers to the need to learn the divine secrets of "the good, the true, and the beautiful."

A natural query arises in regard to these fundamental

needs. Shall both needs be met in the same church service? Yes. William James' studies in religious experience showed that men are broadly divided into two general classes. Some are by nature mystics. Others emphasize the intelligence quotient as the chief basis for satisfactory religious experience. Further studies in the psychology of religion, however, indicate that without instruction the mystic tends to sentimentalism and superstition, and without the practise of worship the moralist lacks the aid of emotion to give poignancy and pungency to his intellectual knowledge. To minister to the whole man and his whole religious life, both priestly and prophetic factors are necessary in every service. Worship supplies the dynamic, and preaching the direction. While Roman Catholic Christianity puts main stress upon the former, and Protestant Christianity upon the latter, neither loses sight entirely of the need for both kinds of ministration.

Our churches, therefore, if dying, are not dying because their services are not based upon proved religious needs. Does it not follow that the trouble lies in our present usages?

Now our present services, though rather haphazardly determined in individual churches, are guided by two principles, esthetics and historic custom. The term "enrichment of service" now prevalent among pastors desiring fuller worship in their church program shows a tendency to make beauty the guiding principle. No doubt esthetic considerations must enter into the making of a service of worship. Beauty, being an attribute of Deity and also belonging in some measure to our imperfect humanity, is an important avenue of communion between the Creator and the creature. The danger, however, is that beauty will usurp the highway. When the beautiful becomes an end in itself, as its advertisement-value in the press notices of the church reveals it too often does, it becomes a dangerous rival to worship. Man's need is of contact with God, not the detachment of artistic appreciation; it is of forgetfulness of form in participation with the spirit behind the form.

To others, the second principle appeals strongly. Many pastors are adopting historic liturgies and rituals. Most recent writers on the subject agree with Friedrich Heiler, in his "Spirit of Worship," who says, "the ultimate basis of all Christian liturgies is the public worship of the primitive Christian community"; and he finds it to be richer and more formal than Baptists have been wont to believe. Primitive usage and historic custom are no doubt a sign of value. They could not have endured otherwise. But scrutinize the matter more carefully. Do not general changes in outlook and in cultural habits deprive ancient forms of their original significance and power? A generation can express in worship mentally and emotionally only along lines of mental and emotional patterns habitual to it. Right here is a hint of the deep-seated trouble weakening our church services. Apostolic sanction and medieval practise are as powerless as estheticism to furnish the needed basis for church worship.

An organism dies when it fails to adapt itself to a changing environment. Through nineteen centuries the church has survived because of its power of adaptation. Has it lost that power now? Is it suffering from mortmain? If so, the way to health is plain. What was the Protestant Reformation but a church reborn along with the general renaissance of humanism? Humanism invaded medieval scholasticism, and the reformed church sprang to exuberant life. What was the vigorous non-conformist movement in England but a religious rebirth due to the new humanism stirring everywhere in the seventeenth century? Democracy, alias humanism, brought the human element into a mechanized institution, and the great non-conformist church was born.

Are there fresh currents of life and thought blowing new health into our modern civilization which might revitalize the church again? Do not our belabeled "new" sociology, "new" philosophy, "new" psychology, "new" pedagogy arise from an invasion of humanism into all areas of thought? Are not

our leaders today echoing Francis Bacon's cry for a *novum organum* and striving in our time as he did in his to adapt all science and all philosophy and all art to human values and human ends? We even have a "new" theology, endeavoring to relate truth to life. Why not find then a *novum organum* for homiletics and have a "new" homiletics based on humanism? Such a procedure seems inherently hopeful. And we have the best of authority for it. Was not humanism implicit in Jesus' revolutionary epigram on public worship? "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for Sabbath." Wanted: A "new humanism" in homiletics.

How can we make our church worship more humanistic? We shall consult that new science of man's soul, psychology, realizing that it is still in its youth and that new facts as they are discovered will demand new adjustments. But the essence of humanism is plasticity. To each day its own way. Let us for this moment of human culture ask of psychology what help it can give in directing us to a kind of service which shall satisfy, for our own moment, men's fundamental need to become aware of God's presence and to enter into conscious communion with Him.

We learn from psychology that our emotions react to environmental stimulus, that we are affected by the atmosphere that arouses or suppresses those subconscious feelings which are the *deus ex machina*, off stage, of our religious life. So the questions of architecture and symbols will have to enter into our inquiry. What kind of a building, what sort of symbols, will best stimulate the worshipful mood and create the awareness of God's presence? If we change our auditoriums into basilicas, if we convert our platforms into chancels, it is not because we wish to preserve the ancient idea of a house of God as a shrine to hold him. It is not that we are imitating our ecclesiastical neighbors. It is because we have learned the psychological principle of creating interest and holding attention to spiritual matters. God will be more visible to the inner

eye if other objects be not in the line of vision. Mind and heart and will will be more continuously held to contemplation if the worshiper is not diverted by the rival attraction of minister, choir, and organ. Only when undisturbed by outside distractions do men's souls go on and on in the quest for the Invisible, God known through the religious imagination. For a like psychological reason, stools for kneeling at prayer are returning to our churches. When the eyes are lowered and the body bent in the posture of prayer men's hearts also bend in reverent seeking for the "Higher-than-self."

Granted that the worshipful mood may be induced by proper environment, how shall that mood be focussed so as to have a vivid sense of God present in the majesty of love, waiting to bless? We Protestants have feared to use symbols lest a fatal human tendency to materialization may cause the sign to become the reality, the symbol to degenerate into an idol. We might perhaps avoid this temptation to our "human, all-too-human" weakness by not using an invariable symbol. A frequently changed symbol would be a keener, because a fresher, stimulus to creative imagination. At all events, in endeavoring to create the awareness of God we must in some way use the psychological fact formulated by the Italian philosopher, Croce, that "the image-forming activity of the mind was developed long before the logical and is far stronger." Pure thought is constantly seeking symbols as crutches to keep it up. Recall the powerful appeal of the Eucharistic Pageant in the recent Chicago Congress.

It is a humanistic task for the psychologist of worship to study how to use symbols which the human spirit needs to sustain itself and yet how to keep them an aid to spirituality and not a way to superstition.

After we have made a worshipful environment and induced awareness of God through symbols comes the main task of the humanist in worship. How develop creative worship, the conscious communion between the worshiper and God?

Humanism begins by giving a new definition to worship. Worship is no longer Luther's impressional service whereby forgiveness and peace are proclaimed by God through the preaching of the Word, nor is it Calvin's equally one-sided service in the other direction, the people's expressional worship of the majesty and glory of God. Humanism says that worship must be creative, both impressional and expressional, a spiritual dialogue between man and his Maker. James' famous dictum, "No impression without expression," applies to the act of worship no less than to the act of learning. No impression is permanently made upon the worshiper until in some way he expresses that impression through some act of worship; nor can there be continually expressive worship without some fresh impression to illuminate and invigorate. Without expression worship becomes senile; without impression worship remains juvenile.

We Protestants have one service of worship which almost perfectly fulfils this double requirement. Our communion service is both impressional and expressional. Because it is a sacramental drama enacted by the worshipers themselves, it is psychologically more effective than the Roman mass, which is impressional only. The baptismal service by immersion is also a reciprocal act, impressive and expressive to the candidate. It is a perfect sacrament. For it preserves the etymological meaning of the term as an oath of loyalty, and the ecclesiastical meaning, as well, "the outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace."

These two services of worship are not enough. Baptism occurs but once in a lifetime, and a too frequent communion service might lessen its solemn significance. Perhaps, too, its connection with the Lord's Supper and its traditional use as an act commemorative of Christ's death and resurrection limit its significance for general worship. Communion with God involves all possible spiritual intercourse. It is impressive of comfort, courage, radiant joy, peace, tranquillity, hope, love,

grace, idealism—every spiritual dynamic from God. And it is expressive, not of penitence only, but of inadequacy of every sort, hunger for righteousness, loneliness, despair, distress, also trust, faith, hopefulness, thanksgiving, exultation—all outpourings of the human spirit Godward. Therefore, in addition to these two occasional sacraments, we need a "sacrament of words," a service of Scripture, sermon, song, and prayer, a liturgy impressive and expressive, a real communion of worship.

If we examine our usual liturgy, the so-called "order of worship," do we find that it satisfies these requirements? What in it is impressional and what is expressional? Are they placed in proper alternation to produce a climactic effect? And are the various parts based upon any felt need or directed toward any significant human value? Do such services have communion with God as their conscious objective or are they merely "opening exercises" centering upon the real business of the day, the sermon? Perhaps the employment of professional singers is an effort toward impressional worship. If so, is it based upon a true psychology? Who worships when concert-trained performers entertain pew-loungers with anthems? Is the Scripture-reading designed for impression? How many hear God speaking during this somewhat perfunctory reading of lessons? Indeed, what is the value of the Scriptures as the minister reads them, without explanation or comment, to create points of contact with the minds and hearts of the hearers? Are they either instructive or worshipful? Are they much more significant impressively or expressively than if read in the original Hebrew or Greek? In many Protestant churches in Europe, the Bible takes the place of the crucifix on the altar, and pastor and people bow before it. Does not our current practise likewise tend to make the Bible a Sibylline book, cryptic but revered?

Cannot the Scripture lessons be handled in a more significant way, that the Bible may be felt as a divine guide-book, help-

ful at the point of need? Consider the congregation which has assembled on a Sunday morning. What diverse thoughts, what differing emotions, what individual desires! How can all these people be brought into a common sense of religious need and a united desire Godward? In some way Scripture and sermon must be woven together with these objects in view. They must constitute the impressional element of our liturgy. Try something radical. Put the sermon not near the close of the service but very early in the service where, with the Scriptures, it will form the impressional part of the service, in preparation for the expressional part to follow.

What that expressional service shall be is another problem in humanism. Here we must take into account the principles of the "new pedagogy" and the "new art" as well as the "new psychology." It would be interesting to learn by questionnaire precisely how significant are our present expressional services of prayers, responses, and hymns. After a five-minute interval what percentage of worshipers could tell the subject of their songs and their psalms? Do they discern any reason why these selections, and not others, were made? How many retain any exaltation or religious emotion derived from them?

Then comes the so-called "pastoral" prayer, the voice of *one* crying in the wilderness, a prayer which from its heterogeneous contents is rather an "omnibus" prayer than a "pastoral" prayer. And is "pastoral" the right ideal for such a prayer? Is it not rather a "congregational" prayer that is needed, if the worship of prayer is to be a true part of the expressional service? Such a prayer should be the emotional response of the people to the preceding impressional service, and the response should be vocal and universal, to make it psychologically expressive. The idea of a real communion in a dramatic dialogue between God and the congregation should direct the structure of the prayer and the significant details of its forms.

Such a dominant idea would create a real humanistic liturgy but it would demand modifications for the special needs and values of each particular church. Therefore we cannot agree with Heiler in theory or with Orchard in practise that any one general form of liturgy can form a basis of church unity. To be related to human needs and values the liturgy of each church must express its own characteristic creedal beliefs; and to have value for any congregation it must be specifically related to the impressional and expressional needs of that congregation on that day.

To make such appropriate services of worship will be an intriguing exercise for every pastor. To help in such work all the liturgies ancient and modern of Jewish and Christian churches offer suggestions for structure and dignified expression. We could make a favorable start with services connected with the Easter and Christmas festivals where custom already allows divergence from ordinary forms. There is also our Communion Service which everybody already acknowledges should be in its entirety a service of worship.

These suggestions need not go into details, for they are but tentative. They come from one student of worship who waits upon other studies and results arising from actual experiments. However, one conviction abides very firm: All worship must be based upon human needs and must eventuate in conscious communion with God and consequent enrichment of the human spirit, else the church will be out of touch with the humanistic trend of our civilization and culture. Wanted: A "new humanism" in worship!

II

Now what about prophecy, our second religious need? Does the suggestion that the sermon be an element in a liturgical unit mean that it loses its Protestant emphasis of education and declines into the minor place occupied by the homily in the Catholic liturgies? By no means. Though it becomes an in-

tegral part of the whole worship, its part is like that of the Actor in the primitive religious drama of the Greeks. The preacher is the spokesman for God, and the rest of the service is the congregational response to the Divine instruction and inspiration. Preaching is not outgrown, despite such statements as are frequently made. "Preaching is an impertinence; what right has any man to get up in a pulpit and tell me what I should do?" "The sermon may not fit into any necessity of mine. At best it is a superfluity, at worst a disaster." The falling off of church attendance may reflect some such attitude, but before we begin to think that perhaps the cry of Moses, "Would God that all men were prophets," was a prediction which our day sees fulfilled, we must call to mind all the tragedies of real life where Adam and Eve have ever delighted to listen to any oracle occupying the prophet's place under "the Tree of Knowledge." Does not the present vogue of Sunday forums also attest that people are still feeling their own insufficiency to meet the problems of life? That they crave help from some expert? Why is instruction from the forum rostrum more popular than from the church pulpit? Does not the secret lie in the greater humanism of the forum? The pulpit is "three feet above contradiction," the forum encourages question. It is a give-and-take between speaker and people. The subject is one suggested by a throbbing interest of the moment and is developed psychologically so as constantly to excite question or response on the part of the listeners. There is present no ghost of scholasticism such as too often still beckons the preacher into a pursuit of knowledge divorced from human and social ends. The forum prophet is not forcing some "Thus saith the Lord: take or leave it at your peril" upon an apathetic congregation. He is helping eager inquirers to find a way of life. Of course, Doctor Cadman and the rest have this advantage over the settled pastor, that they are speaking to special groups called together by the special problem presented at that hour. It is quite another question for the

Sunday-morning preacher, facing his heterogeneous congregation with their diverse needs and their different stages of mental and spiritual development. How can preachers make sermons more humanistic?

We accept the principle of humanism, that man is not made for the sermon but the sermon for man, but we are still groping for some *novum organum*. Convention still holds us in bondage to Aristotle and Euclid for the principles of arriving at and expressing truth. First the axiom, then the proposition with its definition followed by proofs and ending with scholium and corollary—that's the norm. So from time immemorial we preachers have had the text as axiomatic beginning, followed by our thesis based upon it, and illustrations, ending up with corollaries in the form of concluding homilies. Our efforts toward humanism so far have affected only the style and not the structure of our sermons. We have in a measure dropped the prophet's mantle of omniscient dogmatism and hied to the debater, the lecturer, the salesman, for new fashions. But whether we use the argumentative style of the debater, or the explanatory and literary style of the lecturer, or the persuasive style of the salesman and advertiser, our system is the same old one. Although the lecture style is more humanistic than the debater's dialectics, and though salesmanship is based upon psychological principles which determine men's emotional responsiveness as well as their mental reactions, yet our sermon structure remains the same. Still it commences, as of yore, with some *a priori* truth and arrives at its Q. E. D. according to the latest principles of Euclid, 300 B. C.

We preachers should visit one of our advanced schools and study the "new geometry" for some humanistic hints. Why not indeed accept Bacon's *novum organum* for homiletics, and instead of beginning with truth and ending with man, begin with man and end with truth?

This is the "inductive" preaching of which Joseph Fort Newton has written. This term may not be the best for it has

many rationalistic associations. We might borrow a term from art rather than from science, a term which our most humanistic educators have adopted to designate their new kind of pedagogy. The other day they called it "project teaching," but they now abandon that designation as having a somewhat teleological emphasis and call their ideal "creative teaching." (An *ad quem* truth is hardly better than an *a priori*.) "Creative preaching," then, is the term for our ideal. The preacher like the teacher and the artist helps his public to create their own truth. In such reaction the worshipers experience the truth as something peculiarly their own because they have personally created it and personally possess it. Such creation is also associated with an emotional glow which doubles the value of the truth. Joy always accompanies creation. Are we not told in the old story that God himself paused to rejoice after each day's creation?

And God renews his ancient rapture.

The first reaction of theological leaders and probably of homilists will very likely be something akin to fear. What about truth? Can we trust it to the unlearned, undoctored pew? "What is truth?" questioned the old cynic. But one is not necessarily a cynic who raises the question. Einstein has affected the modern attitude toward all idea of "the absolute." Can any truth, however objective and absolute, have value for a person who neither perceives nor acknowledges it? Why, then, be afraid of the implication involved in the humanistic view of truth? Why fear the cooperative search for it within the sanctuary? The sun in the far-off heavens remains unchanged and absolute, though a sun-dial arranged for the latitude of a New England dooryard would not tell the time of day if transplanted to a Persian garden.

Creative preaching is an entrancing ideal. The theme selected will be such as to start individual thinking, and preacher and people together will create some personal frag-

ment of the whole truth which they can know, as they know the sun, only by its relation to themselves. Such sermons will be more difficult to prepare and deliver than those that follow the well-oiled grooves of deductive reasoning. But it is not an impossible task even for young preachers, as I have tested in my classes.

The most modern schools, basing their methods on Dewey's psychology, start the learning process with some problem, some difficulty which is directly related to the pupils' present interests and so stirs their mental activity. The new preaching in like manner will begin not with a truth but with a problem related to the daily interests and religious needs of the hearers. What that problem shall be depends upon the minister's knowledge of their spiritual needs. Though at any given moment these may be diverse, yet his task is to bring them to a focus by the introduction of his sermon. The introduction then, must begin with something which will create a common sense of need and produce a united desire to learn the solution of that consciously felt problem of need. The body of the sermon will be a tour of exploration and investigation to discover that solution. This will appeal to the sense of adventure innate in everybody and the feeling of suspense so pleasing to all, as the greedy reading of mystery stories testifies. The stages of the sermon will be steps of progress toward discovery, dawning clearer and clearer as the sermon proceeds toward its climax.

Was not this the secret of the famous Socratic dialogue? Preachers have been monologists in the past. We must become creators of dialogue, a dialogue no less real because the second party is felt and not heard. The silent participation of the pews should direct the arrangement of the various points of the sermon; for in the sermonic dialogue, unlike the Socratic, the listeners question and the prophet answers. These questions can be only imaginatively perceived by the preacher but if he makes a psychological study of his people he can adequately conjecture their mental and emotional responses.

Moreover, it is his delicate task to create subtly the questioning that he desires. That is the special art of the new creative preaching. So together pew and pulpit create the solution which forms the third portion of the sermon, the conclusion. Scarcely ever should that be expressed in the form of an exhortation. Religious educators, using instructive stories for moral uses, tell us that the force of the moral lies in its silent urge. In the case of the sermon, it may be nobly and powerfully enforced by the solemn reading of text and context as a Scriptural seal upon the goal discovered in our sermonic adventure. Creative preaching would end with the text rather than start out from it.

Such is the form, such the structure, of the humanistic sermon. Where shall we learn the technique of its style? Where gain the creative quality which will arouse and sustain the imaginative participation of our hearers' minds and hearts? Where look for models? To the artists. They are the born creators, the artists of forms, artists of sounds, artists of words. They are unconscious masters of psychology and know how to lead men creatively into the heart of truth.

But God has a few of us whom he whispers in the ear;
The rest may reason, and welcome: 'tis we musicians *know*.

The poets, most of all artists, can help us because their medium, like ours, is language. They must produce their effects with words. The sonnet, for instance, is a perfect model *in parvo* for a sermon, especially a sonnet in which the first quatrain introduces a problem which the second and third quatrains ponder with subtle suggestion of imagery and illustration, holding the solution in suspense till the last couplet when the truth is perfectly and epigrammatically expressed.

From the drama and short story, also, we learn the value and the technique of the plot, with their creative movement of conflict, climax, and denouement. Nor should we be ashamed to consult the dramatist. Has not Dean Inge predicted that

the next great moral leader will probably speak through drama? Was not that the medium of the greatest Greeks? Has not the play of thought its hazards, its tragedies, its comedies? It is "just the instrument," says Will Durant, "for a man whose thought has not congealed into dogmas and a system."

The creative preacher is far removed from the Delphic oracle. He is but the leader of all his congregation in a quest for the Holy Grail. Not all may behold it in its unveiled glory, but every one may get a personal glimpse of its wonder and radiance. "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now." Was not Jesus himself in truth the first-born of creative preachers? The common people heard him gladly because his preaching started from their needs and ended with the truth which would satisfy those needs. How different he was from the Baptist! How different from most preachers of the past! How effective his method in our inductive age! Wanted: A "new humanism" in preaching.

To conclude: The trouble in our present situation arises from the church being out of touch with reality. And the remedy, in one word, is humanism. A greater measure of congregational participation in worship will put reality into liturgy and sermon. The service will be creative drama where spiritual intercourse takes place between the human actors and God. As in the ancient drama of worship in the Greek religious festivals where God spoke and chorus answered, chorus spoke and God answered, God's presence and nearness and grace will be felt, and the result will be creativity.

Jacob dreamed a dream of a ladder from heaven to earth, with angels descending upon it to bring religion to men. A modern poet had a clearer vision when he dreamed that heaven can be known by men who yearn for it enough to climb toward it. Not preachers nor angels can bring heaven down to earth. Men themselves have to "build the ladder" and mount it, round by round, "from the lowly earth to the vaulted skies."

Wanted: A "new humanism" in homiletics.

THE GOSPEL WITHIN THE GOSPEL

ALBERT G. LAWSON, D. D.

New York

ALL truth is God's truth, and no authority can make that true which is not true; but not all truth is preachable. Not all Scripture is preachable, nor is all gospel. We must know what it means before we become its heralds. Man's needs have God's resources as their background, but our needs cannot exhaust the fountain of God's resources.

Preaching the gospel seems the simplest work possible, yet it has the choicest harvests ever garnered on the floor of earth. Two questions arise: What is preaching? What is the gospel?

Preaching is speaking for God in Christ's stead to win men to God and to build them up in him. The "Four Gospels" is not a happy term; rather say the gospel in a fourfold story. There is but one gospel. Wrought into his soul's life any preacher may say with Paul, "my gospel." To extend this gospel through the world is one of the "greater works" Jesus committed to us. Not ours to reason why; ours but to do and die.

To live for God and man and goodness; to live going about doing good, and to die the just for the unjust, creates the gospel that is the power of God unto salvation. Mark opens with "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God." First the facts, then life and action, then a true record, and through it all Jesus Christ, Lord and Saviour, shines forth. "Amplest knowledge has largest faith." When did the gospel begin in our hearts or in the world? When did the gospel begin with God?

Our preaching may be true to Christ yet not true to the whole Christ. Men have put into that word much that Jesus never announced as gospel, as they have put into his parables

much that Jesus never put there. Three things have set Christians in opposing camps for a thousand years about which Jesus never utters one word. And he says things of clearest worth which we cannot call gospel.

The gospel within the gospel is:

I. *Jesus in His Personality.* Discovery, invention, and revelation come to us through personality. The center, standard, motive, and goal of the gospel, its very marrow, the inner life, inner source, inner power of every gospel message is Jesus himself crucified for us. Jesus never said, "Come to church, come to the creed, or come to the cross," but "Come to me," "Believe in me," "Follow me"—come and be of service to others. Jesus did not ask, "What think ye of religion, or of the church?" but "What think ye of the Christ, of me?" His greatness who said, "I am meek and lowly in heart," is the moral miracle of the ages. To give his whole gospel he must be in our hearts, in our messages, and in our assemblies. The great asset of the gospel is Jesus himself with power to lay down his life and power to take it again.

The Lord called Samuel and Paul, standing beside them. Does he stand beside us when we preach as he stands by Phillips Brooks in Saint Gaudens' statue? It is the personality of our Lord and Saviour, not the Nazarene, not the Teacher, not the Sign-worker, but Jesus and him crucified. The inner truth of the gospel and the deepest truth of theology Paul puts in one sentence: "God commends his own love to us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us." "In the way going up to Jerusalem they were amazed, and as they followed they were afraid." He bore our sins *to* the cross, not only *on* the cross.

His dying began when he emptied himself of his glory. Regeneration is spirit and life; but more, it is Christ born in us. "The Word became flesh." The ascent of man is through the descent of the Son of man, and he lifts the common people from the dunghill to his throne. The fourfold story shows

salvation is life. Paul says, "He is made unto us wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption"—a foursquare foundation. With imperial mind, imperial heart, and imperial will his personality shows him to be our true moral example, our true religious example, the one Lord of truth, and the true mediator with God for all men. The Christian's enthusiasm is built on a person, not on an ideal.

II. *The Highest Personality.* His name is above every name. Personality, the apex of individuality, the choicest we will ever know is Jesus Christ far and away above his four reporters, above all apostles and prophets and men called great.

The ebbs and flows of his pure soul
Were tides to the rest of mankind.

The beauty, goodness, and truth of the Greek have their crown in him. What will arrest the people, move the people, win the people is Jesus Christ himself, alive today to give men his own life and spirit. Ideals are foremost, ideals in personalities are controlling, and personalities filled with God are radiant with light and permanent with power. It is great to live in a day when there is a market for ideas. We face spurts of thought not in the books of yesterday, and not in gingerbread and jig-saw utterances.

The world floats between individual goodness, adored but labeled unattainable, and social rottenness disowned but labeled inescapable. Jesus breathed the atmosphere of this world thirty years, and had daily contact with selfish, sin-loving people, yet believed men could be redeemed as he believed in himself. Not what he speaks, not what he does so much, as what he is, saves us. The Chinaman was right, "He turns all our sunsets into sunrise." The contagion of his personality in us is the hope of glory. Back of war burns its passion or shines its principle; back of the gospel burns the passion of Christ and shines the Holy Spirit. John says he is the reality of God. Grace and reality blend in him with no repentance, no ambition, no doubt;

for fear, hope, for tradition, truth, and for death, life. It is the Good Shepherd giving himself for us who is the same yesterday, today, and forever. When the boy asked, "What does God do all day?" his wise mother said, "Just what Jesus did every day."

Through forty memorable days Jesus interprets the kingdom in the light of the death of the king, and the apostles have a richer gospel. They see the crown of thorns become a crown of glory and the gibbet the symbol of salvation. He cannot fail nor be discouraged; his name is above every name. "When he died sin lost its chief servant, death; for now death ministers life." Being lifted up, he draws all men to himself. Interpret the world in the light of Jesus' death, and "the cross becomes the touchstone of the philosophy of the universe." Paul bases world brotherhood on world redemption through the cross.

III. *The Personality of the Minister.* "There was a man sent from God." Personality in the Master requires personality in the minister, and there is healthy humanness in the man sent from God. Luther's work could not be done without Luther, or Wesley's work without Wesley, or Spurgeon's or Finney's or Moody's work without these men. In humble reverence we speak; God could not complete his work without men. John the herald, Peter at Pentecost, Philip in Samaria, Paul and Barnabas—how could their work have been wrought without the men? Dr. A. J. Gordon used to say, "The world needs not more men but more Man." Give us in each minister more *Man* set free to think, to speak, and to do the will of God. The tang and tone of a man draw men. A good minister of Jesus Christ must be a man to be the master of men.

"God Almighty's gentleman," Dryden's term, may ride in the engine cab or the Pullman car, or be a waiter in the dining-car, but he must be a man. Christianity like civilization dies at the top; some who know the most live the worst and chill the people at the foot of the ladder. Our churches have been hurt more by weak ministers than by weak members.

Character is power, Christian character is supreme power, and as organs at the full we should be alive with energy. Personality may be as contagious as disease, and our gospel should be contagious. Our personality transfigured by Christ has its glory in whole-souled surrender to his sovereign control. Moses made many priests, but stood far above them as he communed with God looking for the prophet who should come.

The truth must come through affection, through character, through the whole moral and intellectual being. Elisha's staff was not Elisha. On the two legs of ability and character stand erect as a man. What we are, not what we say, puts live coals into the hearts of men. The people keep closer tabs on our conduct than on our beliefs. Wear "the white flower of a stainless life." Live so that one who looks into our eyes may see into our souls and believe that we are what we seem to be. The minister's life may be the life of his ministry; for me to live is Christ, to live the one note of his example.

Phillips Brooks said, "Doubt, darkness, fear, and unbelief need not an argument but a live man to throw them." Yes, a live man with a true argument. Goods and goodness, faith and fear, wealth and commonwealth mix well in the dictionary but not in a minister's daily life. We must speak out what we truly believe even if it throws us into a hornet's nest. That is better than to let our tongues run away with our brains in speech that is not honest. Full hearts but empty heads do not make good prophets for God. "He also is wise." God blesses us in thinking; our congregations need and ought to have real thinking. Large areas of the soul wait to be explored; seas of thought are yet uncharted, and Jesus is the Captain of thought. True thinking stirs up questions and difficulties, but deeper thinking lets in light, and deepest thinking ripens knowledge into wisdom. Never sink clear thinking into mere cleverness. We must not be deceived when crowds come; attendance may be easy, but attention is another matter. Fewer churches with stronger men would often be welcome.

Long ago Japanese students said to Henry Drummond, "Send us one \$6,000 man rather than ten \$2,000 men."

a. Personality in Experience. "I know only so much as I have lived." "One thing I know." "I know whom I have believed." Our Lord's choicest words came out of his experience. St. Beuve says, "Absolute doctrines in all matters have reached their limits, and the best minds are leaning on experience." Spiritual experience of the passion and presence, the power and life of our Lord will make our sermons fruitful. Revelation is first experience; faith, not logic, is the surer guide, and reason plays a minor part in valuing truth. Science and philosophy say, "Law reigns"; the experience of the book and the heart say, "God reigns."

Alertness, goodness, magnetism, and sympathy may spring up in unlooked-for places, as in Amos and Hosea. Experience gives capacity for growth, and growth invites change. Urge for consistency may sink into idolatry, and a man bow down to himself. Personality and power are twins, and stronger men are coming. Ideas, ideals, and the purpose to attain them are invisible; with the will to achieve them they loom into sight as controlling forces. Have faith in ideals not merely as projections ahead of us to be grasped, but as rich inspirations within to be wrought out by us. Personality is a dynamic entity; with cumulative power it moves us forward, and the spiritual personality walks with God day by day.

Freedom of inquiry, appeal to life, positive conviction, all enter into experience. In a sermon heard recently one said: "I think so; it seems to me; I imagine." But that soft stuff will not move men. As well "plow the sea with oxen." Such a man might study botany on the grave of his mother. You do not take your dog to the art gallery; do you take more than your manuscript to the pulpit? We need the note of assured conviction, the note of true authority. Ring it out with Paul, "I believe God." Jesus a real man lived a real life, among real people, doing good to all. Only that which is real is truly

known, hence Jesus is so well known. Are religion and life drifting apart? Yet religion is made for life, and life comes to its richest fruitage only through religion.

We face two questions: Is our religion intelligently defensible? Does it build a man's all-round life? In answering no one should make his own experience a type for another. Otto well says, "Religious experience may be rolled out so thin and flat as finally to dissolve." The plainest man has a right to his own mind; his right to think as his right to live without attack from others. "The love of God is broader than the measure of men's minds." A preacher's conceit may be so great that any dish he sets up for his people is good enough if it is only new. We may think ourselves Alpine peaks, but we should not spoil the little plants at the foot of the mountain. Our noblest living grows with the constant effort to have every other man living in Christ. Thomas Goodwin the Puritan said, "There is an instinct for Christ in every man." Call out that instinct in all you can reach, and Christ will be enriched in you. Cultivate grace and skill in persuading men to receive Christ. At Sychar the Twelve sought bread, Jesus sought a harvest of souls. The highest revealing of God is shown to one the lowest down. To a woman, a social, moral, and religious outcast, he says, God is a spirit and seeks you to worship him.

Be open-minded to books, to thoughts, to men, but take orders from Christ. Resist the ebb of the catholic spirit in your own mind. The whole truth is not in our chapels and at our altars alone. The spirit of religion is in Judaism and Romanism as well as in Protestantism. Stalwart saints arise in all their ranks, "the eyes of whose hearts are open to God." Do not be squeamish about that word "saint"; saints are men who make it easier for the rest of us to believe in God. We must not bank too heavily on the piety of our own groups; the Man of Galilee finds the gold of God in members of every communion. Resist the pressure for mass movement; religious

emotion cannot be standardized. Emphasize the individual. The soul's unseen forces moving through "the crannies of the being like soft rootlets" can break hardest hearts, win reluctant brains and give us

The men for whom the world is waiting
To sing the breathings of its mighty heart.

b. Personality of Fellowship. Mark says Jesus chose the Twelve to be "with him," to share his life, and to have the fruit of his spirit. Tucked away in the Chronicles it is written of some they were "with the king for his work." We could not live in the altitude of the stars, yet we do have access to God and may walk with him. We are not priests or prophets of the Old Testament, or apostles of New Testament days, or monks of the desert, but ministers of the twentieth century, men sent from God for the work of today, and we must live in the atmosphere of today. God made the world and must make the worker; he made the mind and must make the minister who lives not in some new Jerusalem midway between heaven and earth, but in the midst of dirt and sin. We must live with the people to know them and to be healers of the ills of humanity. A boy said, "A skeleton is bones with the people off them." Our sermons, skeleton or otherwise, must have the people on them. Dean Stanley used to say, "The religion of the first century was the religion of the Good Shepherd." Doctor Pisek, Bohemian Presbyterian, and Doctor Wenner, German Lutheran, have each been for fifty years in the one parish, and both on the East Side of New York City. Grow a genius for appreciation, share with your people, and never be afraid of an explosion.

Three things enter into fellowship: mutual self-revealing, mutual self-surrender, and mutual interest in the largest realities. Romanists have put their "confessional" to poor uses, but the idea, the worth, and the choicest use of confessions of sin and suffering belong to Jesus and the New Testament. We

must know our people, and they must be free to take us into their inner need. The vine and the branches must have the one life. Deepest sympathy with those in need, horror at the waste of life all about us, and the unending moral struggle in their desires for the best life possible should bind our souls to them.

The sins that Jesus most heavily condemned and the virtues he most heartily commended were connected with fellowship. Jesus puts it above worship. Leave your gift at the altar and find your offended brother. Joseph said, "Come near to me, my brothers." Out of a breaking heart Jesus says: "Why so foolish; will ye also go away; could ye not watch with me one hour?" Alas for us if we lose the shepherd spirit! That we must have for all men if we would win all for Christ. God and man are of one spirit, and the true relations between the Father and his children are the basis of real fellowship. The marrow of unity is not common belief in spite of evidence or in spite of consequence, but my life swallowed up in his life. Paul said, "I believe God" at the risk of sailors and soldiers tossing him overboard. He would witness to the real God at any cost. Bring the comforts of grace to your people; he gives power to the faint, and to them that have no might he increases strength." Search out "the glories of unanswered prayer," the riches of grace in "the loving forgetfulness of God" for the sick at heart, and nourish them into health. We must suffer with them really to know them; saving and serving are true yokefellows.

c. Personality of Leadership. It has four dimensions: believe in yourself, believe in men, believe in God, and believe in victory—a good daily diet with your daily dozen.

Self-reverence, self-knowledge, self-control,
These three alone lead to sovereign power.

Ole Bull said of a minister, "He didn't seem to say much and didn't seem to believe what he said." It is hard to score

a bad sermon without seeming to scoff at a good text. We are not postmen but brothers, not merely messengers but living messages. Tracts in boots make marks that last. "Such as I have give I thee," said Peter. We cannot give what we do not have, but do we always give what we have? To save up bright thoughts as choice bits for extra occasions is a mistake. Fling them out as you get them if you would really grow in mental alertness.

Our sermons must be for our people; subject, time, method, speaker all in tune together. Preach Christ for this world, not only for the world to come. Preach in the real social language of today not good advice but the gospel. We cannot collect drafts on the future to cover up bankruptcy in the present. Speak to the man within the man, to the mind you cannot see. The stranger is your brother. Speak as a leader, the agent, the energy of God to lift men to God through Christ in whose stead we speak. Preach the qualities highest in your own experience and resources, those truths that witness most for Christ and that touch humanity. Insist that the Golden Rule and the Law of Love with the Great Commission be wrought into the daily life. How many new members are asked about these three things or disciplined if they do not live up to them?

Dependence on God, fellowship with God, and Godlikeness are constants. Every sermon should reveal three constituents: intellectual integrity, sympathetic spirit, and practical worth. A little child said, "A parable is a heavenly thing without any earthly meaning." Do some of our sermons fit that explanation? We must keep our feet on the ground. Feed your imagination on the side of reverence, your passion for oratory on the side of sincerity, simplicity, and humility. As good soldiers of Jesus Christ lay siege to Mansoul and win for God. Who does not dare to fail will not succeed, and we may seem to fail when we are truly succeeding. An occasional failure to a true-blooded man may be worth more than success.

Leadership is especially needed in evangelism and education at the peril of decay in our own souls. We cannot leave these to deans of seminaries and professional evangelists. We should have with Baxter "a thirsty desire for man's conversion and salvation." Paul writes to Timothy, "Do the work of an evangelist; complete thy ministry." Men were always worth more to our Lord than food. Live so near to him that his enthusiasm of love may be the calm habit of our souls. We face the world he died to save,

The world . . . unknowing, blind, and unconsolated.

The bulk is large, changes are rapid and baffling, but souls may be touched and won to the personal Christ every day.

Education and evangelism are as two arms. Horace Mann, in the earlier days, told of one minister who trained one hundred men; another had one hundred and fifty students, and Finney in the one city of Rochester led forty men into the ministry. Help men to set free their entombed powers for Christ's service. Exhibit the difference between dogmatic declarations and dynamic expositions of truth. Warning every man and teaching every man—both elements are needed. Joshua was full of wisdom, "for Moses had laid his hands upon him." Have we laid the hand of reverent love on men and won them to Christ's ministry? We must live near the Lord to draw men to his ministry, but oh, the joy of it.

The true leader will "remember Jesus Christ" and hit something. Foes and friends will arise, but his ministry of courage must not be shaped by either. If assailed, "be not dismayed at them lest I dismay thee before them." Put your pulpit high, but Christ higher. "I will draw all men unto myself." Sublime optimism and deeper mystery, but mystery adheres to philosophy, science, and religion. The burden of the gospel is God's love and man's worth—great facts and greater truths. No wonder the early preachers turned the

world upside down. Preach the Cross but Christ crucified, preach the resurrection but Jesus and the resurrection, preach his return but as in John 14. Is Jesus truly alive to us as we preach? "Is Jesus as real to you as your mother?"—a question actually put to a minister. Matthew closes with five universals compassing heaven and earth. Lead men up to the higher truths to the larger Christ and the larger God. Do we find the heart of God laid bare in Jesus Christ? The Bible is theocentric; in the beginning God, and God leads from first to last. Mark and Paul and Peter speak of "the gospel of God." Seven times we have that term in the New Testament. Have we ever fathomed its depths? Define "the gospel of God" in the terms of Jesus' life and death and resurrection to know its pure gold. At the end Jesus gives up all to the Father as Paul shows. God is in Christ not only on the cross but to the cross, always dwelling and moving in him.

Preach the love of God, but in all its fulness. To preach the love of God unbound to the death of Christ; or to preach the love of God in the death of Christ but unbound to sin; or to preach the love of God and the forgiveness of sin as God's free gift but unbound to the death of Christ, is not the gospel. The death of the cross has three constituents for heaven and for earth: The innocent suffer with the guilty, the innocent suffer more than the guilty, and the innocent suffer for the guilty. Be sure all three are made known. Be wise as serpents and harmless as doves in dealing with men; but with the arm of a giant and the eye of a lynx deal with sin. We ministers cannot afford to live the lower life, for we may be tempted as Whittier sings, "To save our soul and winter's pork with the least possible outlay of sanctity and salt."

Move up from the areas of meadow and mist to the hill-tops of highest living. Our hearts must be set on infinite values and move up to levels of permanent worth. Then may the quick returns of the earth life be swallowed up in the far gains of the spirit life and satisfy our souls. The gospel within the

gospel is Jesus himself; to possess him and to have him possess us is salvation, Christ in us the hope of glory.

Oft when the Word is on me to deliver
Lifts the illusion and the truth lies bare,
Desert or throng, the city or the river,
Melts in a lucid paradise of air—

Only like souls I see the folk thereunder,
Bound who should conquer, slaves who should be kings,
Hearing their one hope with an empty wonder,
Sadly contented in a show of things;

Then with a rush the intolerable craving
Shivers throughout me like a trumpet-call;
Oh, to save these! to perish for their saving,
Die for their life, be offered for them all!

—*F. W. H. Myers.*

THE DOCTRINE OF SALVATION

Professor SPENSER B. MEESER

Crozer Theological Seminary

My thesis is that Jesus Christ is Saviour, not, as proposed in the Satisfaction Theories of Atonement, by becoming a penal substitute victim, who in his death satisfies some theoretical demand in God's nature, or in the moral constitution of the universe; nor, as proposed in the bare Moral Influence Theories, in his functioning as teacher, example, and a personal moral influence; but *as the effect and effectuating agent of God's good-will toward men, the living incarnate good-will of God in history; and as a present, continuing moral and spiritual dynamic in the life of men.*

There are certain postulates to this thesis, which I can only state and use, since space will not permit extended discussion of them. For instance:—

1. I hold with Abelard that, in the relation of man and God, it is enmity in man and not in God which needs to be eradicated; that propitiation is irrelevant as applied to God; though I reject the idea that Christ's service in salvation is adequately described or evaluated as wholly in his death as "a winning exhibition of love."

2. I hold with Duns Scotus that God may sovereignly forgive without requiring reparation for sin.

3. I hold, more or less, with the Socinians, that "justice" in God, or what may with moral consistency be conceived as justice in God, does not require suffering for sins, but only that sin be abandoned; though I reject as inadequate the doctrine of the Socinians that Christ's service is simply that of teacher who morally influences men.

4. I hold that "Grace" is undeserved, unprocured, unpaid-for love, unbought, and beyond requital. If any price or penalty is paid for sin, either by the debtor-sinner, or another in his

stead, there is no grace in so-called "forgiveness"; and no forgiveness at all in the proper sense.

5. I hold that the word "Atonement," as used in current discussions, is essentially pagan in conception, and inapplicable in this connection. It is a misnomer when applied to Jesus' saving service and ought not to be used so to designate that service. For it is not a New Testament word, and is not used by the New Testament writers either to designate and certainly not to describe the service of Jesus; and the word does not carry the meaning of "atonement" as used in the Old Testament; and especially because the word implies, as related to God, some things not justified by Jesus' teaching about God, and repugnant to any truly moral conception of him.

In view of the criticism of the current theories of atonement in the light of a fuller exegesis of the Biblical teaching, and in harmony with the principles of man's moral judgment, we offer the following theoretic statement, which may be presented in five brief propositions:

A. In Salvation, the grace and the forgiveness of God are free and sovereign; that is to say, they are not procured by, or contingent upon, the will, or the action of any other; nor are they determined by anything outside of God himself.

B. The life and service of Jesus Christ as Saviour, which involve his death, are related to the forgiveness of God, not as procuring cause or justifying conditions, but as the effect and the effectuating agencies of his sovereign grace and forgiveness. Jesus Christ seeks to make good in man the grace and the forgiveness which God freely gives.

C. Jesus Christ achieves, or makes good, God's free forgiveness in man (a) by actually giving it historic reality and concreteness; and (b) by making it spiritually real in the hearts of the believers.

D. He makes God's grace and forgiveness real and concrete by actually living and achieving the love of God, the forgiveness of God, God's judgment on sin and his approval of

righteousness; all of which require his sufferings and death for their adequate expression.

E. He makes God's grace and forgiveness personally and spiritually real by his presence and power in the heart of the believer; working, as indwelling Spirit, the moral renewal of man. With the free forgiveness of God and the moral renewal of the heart, salvation is complete.

In the effort to establish this doctrine of salvation we have to contend with popular and uncritical interpretations of Biblical teaching which are reflections of views long and tenaciously held. In addition to these are unethical views of what salvation consists in; of what is the spring and source of salvation; of the aim of salvation; of the motive force and condition of salvation; of the method of salvation; of the significance and relation of Jesus' person and work to salvation. These elements of the problem are now to be considered.

I. THE PROBLEM OF SALVATION

The problem of salvation is simply stated: Its factors are a righteous God and sinful man. Its concerns are: How can a holy God and a sinful man continue to exist in the same universe? How may God achieve righteousness in man and thus establish harmony in the universe? How may God be rid of sin without destroying man? The problem of sin is primarily God's problem, and Jesus Christ is his solution of the problem.

II. THE SOURCE AND SPRING OF SALVATION

Salvation has its source and spring in the creative purpose of God. God can and may reasonably be conceived to have created man as a free, moral, self-determining being—a person—for communion with himself; and to have set him in a right, though not a completed, relation to himself; that is, God created man non-morally innocent. Communion could be completed only by man's own will to be and to do the right, and thus achieve perfect moral personality, for righteousness in a

person requires the moral creative power of the free personality himself. God could not make man righteous by creative fiat. To make man righteous involves a process which includes the activity of man's will.

Even such communion as was possible with the non-morally innocent was broken by sin; the higher communion with man, as righteous, was postponed, and God's purpose was apparently foiled. After sin had entered the world God has no option but (a) to abandon his purpose in creating man, that is, let him go on in his sin and in moral self-disregard maintain communion with him; or (b) to destroy man altogether; or (c) to become himself Saviour and to win man to righteousness.

It is incredible that God should endure sin and maintain communion with man. Sin is a stern reality of the human will which cannot be condoned. It is unthinkable that God should be forever defeated, even temporarily foiled in his creative purpose. To become Saviour therefore appears to be the only solution of the matter of which sin is the occasion. Furthermore it is incredible that God should not have foreseen this issue, or that he could have viewed that issue and its problem with complacency. It seems inevitable therefore that salvation was a foreseen part of creative purpose, rather than a device to meet a problem that had unexpectedly arisen. Salvation continues and furthers the moral design of creation, and in it God becomes Saviour, to the end of making man *wholly* in his image.

III. THE AIM OF SALVATION

The aim of salvation is, therefore, one with the aim of creation, namely—to achieve righteous personality in man, and thereby to raise him to fitness for fellowship and communion with God. This includes, as necessary corollary, to save man from sin; but the primary purpose is positive, to achieve righteousness. Salvation is constructive and creative and not simply remedial, to counteract the effects of sin. Neither is the aim primarily to save man from the suffering sin brings, i. e., to

save man from the pains of hell. It aims to save man from sin itself and from the consequences of sin so far as these have power to deepen and strengthen the hold which sin has on man, and insofar as these penalties alienate him from God. To seek to save man from the penalties of sin without the consideration of the issues involved would not be moral in God and might well be inimical to the best or the highest interests of the sinner. It would be better that the penalty of sin were suffered and the sinner saved from sin, than that he should escape the penalty and be left in sin. The salvation which seeks to achieve righteousness in man and to save him from sin may, however, well include progressive remedial escape from penalty.

IV. THE MOTIVE FORCE IN SALVATION

This doctrine involves the conception that *all the being of God* impels him to become Saviour, and that there is therefore unity and harmony in all of his nature. Many theories of salvation conceive God as being bicentric, and set one part in opposition to another part. Each of the activities of his being, we hold, urges God to the one and same end, i. e., the achievement of righteousness in man. Holiness, love, and justice are not to be conceived as in conflict in him, either as the means or as ends. The fundament of ethics and religion is that God be conceived as self-consistent in all his attributes and harmonious in all his activities. What love inspires, holiness and justice equally inspire.

I. Thus love is the motive force in salvation. By God's love we mean, the desire and will of God for moral perfection of man; the longing to attain his eternal purpose, begun in creation. Such love is native to God and eternal in him. It is not the effect of an action by another. It arises in the fount of his being; from the beginning God loved. That love finds its expression in the creation of man. As describing his character we may say that "God is love." Its profoundest disclosure is in Jesus Christ; and the summit is in Christ's passion service.

Salvation is the continuing creation of man. We must persistently beware of conceiving love in God sentimentally, as mere clemency; that is, as either non-moral or ethically weak. Because God is holy, love in him is holy love—moral love. The love of God is therefore best conceived as the altruistic concern of God for the moral good of his creatures. Whatever more love in God may be, it is never less than this, and never contrary to this.

2. Thus also holiness is the motive force in salvation. By holiness we mean the moral excellence of God, and God's impulse to make his moral creatures like himself. Holiness in God is necessarily conceived as dynamic and not static; it is of necessity active and not passive; vital and not legal. Therefore we may assume that as holy, God necessarily would seek to achieve holiness in moral beings; to express and have men confess and achieve, in themselves, holiness. Salvation thus arises in the dynamic moral excellence of God.

3. The justice of God is the motive force in salvation. By justice in God we mean the impulse and will in God to deal with his moral creatures according to their nature as free moral personalities, to the end of their moral perfection. Justice is fundamentally the impulse of God to fit or adjust men to their eternal environment which he himself is.

Justice is commonly conceived as an eternal necessity in God to punish sin; and the penalty is regarded as an eternal inevitable consequence of sin, to be endured by the sinner or by some one else in his stead. In this idea men have overlooked the essential redemptive purpose of penalty. Moral considerations forbid us to ascribe penalties either to a vindictive or a vindicatory motive in God. As vindictive they would be immoral in God; as vindicatory they would be confession of the lack of inherent worth in the laws they are supposed to vindicate. Their moral value should be self-vindicating. We are compelled, then, to think of penalty as for the sake of reformation.

In the ethical enlightenment of the day men are coming to see clearly that the moral justification for inflicting penalties on the criminal, the only justice in these penalties, is that men seek to reform the criminal, and thus adjust the criminal to his social environment. Human governments, in their effort to secure righteousness, have used arbitrarily inflicted pain or penalty, because men have been moved not primarily by consideration for righteousness or the good of the criminal, but by the consideration of social defense; not by holy love but by self-protection. Social penalties have been strictly punitive, and were aimed at the prevention of crime by making men suffer for it; and sometimes they have taken the form of vengeance, which morally degrades society. Justice in government has been falsely conceived as the social necessity to punish crime. Slowly, but surely, perhaps, men are coming to perceive a more moral idea of justice, as is evidenced in such modern movements as reformatories, suspended and intermediate sentences, parole, and juvenile courts. This may involve disciplinary pain, owing to the moral reaction of the state against crime and the process of its prevailing in human life; but its aim is reformation to which suffering is but a means. It is time that our moral characterization of God kept pace with our socio-moral ideals, if we would successfully commend him to our generation.

We ought to distinguish between justice statically conceived and justice dynamically conceived. In the first sense justice is fitness, suitableness—that which is adjusted or fitted to. When with this conception in mind we say “God is just” we mean he is fair; takes everything into consideration; fits his judgment and his action to the deed or the person who is judged. The justice of God then means that quality in him which will not permit him to take advantage with his power, or use it save in a wholly moral and fair way. In a word it means that God deals with men according to their natures, as free moral personalities. In the second sense, when justice is con-

ceived dynamically it must mean that quality in action with power to achieve.

But now—what action is fit or fitted to a moral personality, to a being who has power to become worse or better, to resist or to acquiesce in the holy will of God? Two answers have been given: (a) Suffering, as pure penalty; suffering, conceived as punishment; thus theology and the general thought of men. (b) Forgiveness and love, with suffering conceived educationally, as discipline. And this alone is fitted to moral personality and capable of achieving the main moral end in the universe—which is righteousness in man. In the former sense, justice is legally conceived and is ill-fitted to recover the moral person to moral life. In the latter sense, justice is morally conceived; and thus conceived it is inherently consistent with justice to forgive sin without expiation, *if by forgiveness men are turned from sin, reconciled, adjusted to God.* Justice requires only what love and moral excellence require, viz., that man be turned in will and conduct to righteousness. *There is in God no inherent necessity that sin be punished, but only that it be abandoned.* And to this end and purpose alone can what we call “penalties” be conceived as appropriate.

V. THE METHOD OF SALVATION

The method of salvation is by God’s sovereign grace and free forgiveness, and by the moral renewal of the sinner.

I. *Forgiveness.*

We have seen that God could not condone sin; that it is incredible that his creative purpose should be defeated; and that all the elements of his being impel him to save man. What shall he do? As a matter of fact there is but one thing to do, namely: So to deal with man in sin as to save him from sin and persuade him to righteousness; for to punish sin by its only adequate penalty, death, would be to lose man and defeat the creative purpose; to treat sin in a way external to man, in an

innocent personal victim, for instance, so as to save man from the punishment of sin, would simply postpone the real problem; to ignore, or merely to cover sin, would make God morally inconsistent with himself, since he cannot, as holy, condone sin.

In treating sin so as to save the sinner, then, he must "keep hold on the sinner's will," must keep the sinner feeling the obligation of righteousness. How shall he so treat sin? There is but one way, namely, by forgiving the sinner. It is only by forgiving the sin that righteousness can keep its hold on the will of man, or "maintain itself in the heart of the offender." God must treat sin so as to retain his authority in man, and keep his grip on the human will. For if sin be punished in the total of its deserts, the law's debt is paid and the offender is free of obligation. If sin be adequately punished by death or the separation from God (the deepest penalty of sin), the law is upheld and "justice" is satisfied, it is true, but the sinner is lost. If the penalty be borne by another, the case is worse yet; for the sinner is free without suffering the penalty of sin; and the law of righteousness, being without penal sanction, may be despised with impunity. Law persists as obligation only when its infraction or violation is forgiven. Indeed, forgiveness strengthens the obligation and increases its imperative mightily.

We do not mean that by physical power or legal enactment the law may not still be imposed on the sinner who has been punished; as the law of the state still binds the criminal on his exit from jail. *But the law in this case is outside the will of the criminal and imposed on him.* In such a case we can have—in the formal sense—right action; but no obedience, no righteousness in the moral or spiritual sense. So also the moral law may still be an obligation on the punished sinner; may, by the power in the moral God, press and oppress him; *but it is outside of the will of the sinner and can never work righteousness in him; because righteousness springs from obedience within the will of man.* The problem of salvation then is how to treat sin so

as to keep the law of righteousness within the will of the sinner, to save men to righteousness, which is the love for and the will to do right.

The only way to do this is to forgive sin. Forgiveness treats sin effectively without casting out the law from the man's will. Penalties go wide of the mark of real salvation. Unless God keeps his foothold in the life of the sinner, he does not save man from the life of sin to righteousness. Forgiveness is the one treatment which eminently makes man conscious of sin, makes him his own accuser, his own judge and awarder. In this process the claims of righteousness persist enforced and strengthened. *It makes the sinner the eternal debtor to the grace of God.* He is forgiven his sin; but not released from, rather more deeply obligated to, the law of righteousness.

This forgiveness of God is free and sovereign. There is no other kind of forgiveness. It arises in all the impulses and necessities of God's nature. It means that love and holiness prevail over sin and persist in the being and heart of God, in spite of sin. It is love's way of saving, but it is also the way of holiness and justice. It involves the remission of sin, and with sin go its penalties. For one might be conceived as saved from a "penalty-hell," and remain in sin, a hell of a worse sort. To be saved from sin is to be saved from any sort and all sorts of hell.

2. *The Moral Renewal of the Sinner.*

What relation to the sovereign forgiveness of God have the services of Christ? Why should Christ need to live, teach, suffer, and die? Evidently not the relation of procuring cause, as has been said. Equally evident is it that they were not endured to make it possible for God to forgive, or to justify God in forgiving. How then are the services of Christ related to the free forgiveness of God?

Note these two factors in the problem: (1) *Sovereign free forgiveness, like any other free act of God, must consist with*

God's character. (2) *He who forgives sin is under moral obligation to himself to recover the sinner to righteousness*, and this means his determination to bring about the moral renewal of the forgiven person.

(1) Forgiveness, like any other sovereign activity of God must give expression to his character as holy. It must be moral forgiveness and must express his moral reaction against sin and his judgment on it. It must not merely excuse or overlook sin. It must condemn sin even while remitting it. For forgiveness does not, cannot, consist with the continuance of the sin principle in man. That must be eradicated; the nature must be renewed; the will won to goodness; or else forgiveness makes light of righteousness, and so is immoral. One may conceive a legal forgiveness for sin against an arbitrary law with legal penalties attached to its violation. Such forgiveness may relieve one from his legal guilt and the legal penalties; but in morals and religion, righteousness, sin, penalties, and forgiveness cannot be so construed; for they arise in and are related to the nature of God and man, and are wrought into their relations. Such forgiveness is not the forgiveness of the Bible or religion. Certainly it is not salvation from sin and does not fulfil the purpose of God in salvation.

In God, therefore, sovereign, free forgiveness must consist with the necessities and demands of his own being which impels him to forgive and to save, i. e., his love, his holiness, and his justice. Sovereign, free forgiveness must itself conform to the law of holiness in the nature of God, just as any other sovereign free action of God must conform to his nature. In a being not responsible to a higher being, all action must and will be determined by the motive and impulse which inspire that action, i. e., his action will be rational and not merely capricious. Any action to be rational must take form from and be determined by the character of the being from whom it springs. God must act out his own nature when he acts. This is but to say that all action in a rational being must be in har-

mony with his character. Even free action must be rational in this sense; can mean only such action as is in harmony with the character of the agent. That is what freedom in God is—the freedom to act in harmony with his being.

Sovereign free forgiveness therefore cannot mean forgiveness “nilly, willy,” without relation to or determination by the character of the person granting it, or the character of the one forgiven. Sovereign forgiveness can mean only such forgiveness as is determined by the character of God; and such as is in keeping with the offender’s character. The character of God, then, holy, loving and just, predetermines the nature and conditions of his forgiveness. It is free in that it arises in his love and holiness, and the impulse of his whole being. It is free in the sense that it is not bought or procured by anything outside of himself. It is free also in the sense that he has the power to act out all these impulses of his being. It is conditioned, only as all rational action, by the very character of him in whom these impulses arise; i. e., the forgiveness of God must be righteous, a moral forgiveness. It is in this fact that the necessity arises in God for Christ’s service. In order that forgiveness may be moral; in order that it shall have, as God’s action, the quality of his own being; in order to divine self-regard, free sovereign forgiveness involves the service of Christ. That service of Christ realizes in history the love of God, his judgment of sin, and the assurance of forgiveness and the recovery of the sinner. It is the form and character which the sovereign free forgiveness of God must assume in history, because it is necessarily related to his being as a rational moral person and conditioned by his character as holy.

(2) In man alone are there any other conditioning elements to sovereign free forgiveness—sin and the sin-inclined will. Forgiveness is to be conceived therefore as the remission of sins and the eradication or rooting out of the sin principle in man. The remission of sins is through God’s forgiveness, and the rooting out of the sin principle is by the activity of the

living Christ within the heart of the believer. *Forgiveness, that is, involves the moral recovery of the sinner to righteousness.*

One has no right to declare, or power to grant, forgiveness unless he can and does make the forgiveness good to and in the will of the offender, by recovering him to good-will, so that he hates to repeat the offense and wills not to do so. *He who forgives is under obligation to achieve righteousness in the person forgiven.* He, who otherwise declares forgiveness, makes light of righteousness, even denies its significance and worth, makes void the moral law and empties sin of its meaning and guilt. If he be a man and do this latter thing, he sins against God, for God is holy. Man has neither right nor power to condone sin even by this quasi-forgiveness. He sins against society by letting the offender free without reparation, thereby encouraging the repetition of wrong. If he be God, he cannot do this, for thereby he would reveal that he is not morally self-respecting; and that he makes light of his own moral nature, as well as that of the universe, which has its source in his being.

The only forgiveness rationally and morally relevant to the salvation of man is one in which God conforms to the requirements of his own being in forgiving man, i. e., one in which he accomplishes in man the change from sin to righteousness. Holy love forever compels him to save; to save he must forgive. He cannot as holy condone sin. Therefore, forever he bears in himself the reaction of his holiness against sin, its reality, its pain and horror, without the loss of love to the sinner; and forever, as Spirit, he is active in the heart of man to renew man morally. *The moral renewal of man is the price God pays for the sake of holy self-consistency in forgiving and saving.* It is the necessity, as it is the expression of the right, of a holy person to forgive. His own nature demands it of him; his spontaneous impulses meet the demand.

To recur to the question: What need is there of Jesus

Christ and his work, and how can his work as such be conceived? The work of Jesus is to give historic reality to God's love and reaction against sin, and to effect in man his forgiveness. His sovereignty is conditioned by his character as holy and by sin in man. Forgiveness therefore involves that he make real in history, where man is in sin, his judgment against sin; and that he morally recover man. Jesus Christ, his life and teaching, his suffering and death realize in history that moral judgment of God on sin, and are involved in the moral recovery of man. He is Saviour first by realizing, in actual contact with man, the love of God for man, and the recoil of God against sin; and second by working in man, as "the Spirit of God in Christ," the regeneration of man. *God justifies himself in forgiving sin by doing through Christ the work in man which turns man to righteousness. The only justification which God needs for the remission of sin is the moral one, i. e., that forgiveness aims at and achieves the abandonment of sin by man.* This real goal of the Redeemer's saving work involves his life in and among men, his teaching, his death, his resurrection, and his spiritual indwelling in man; because it involves the revelation of judgment on sin, the revelation and approval of righteousness, the revelation of the reality and moral significance of divine love, and the recovery of man to goodness.

Jesus Christ, as God-in-the-human, in his life, teachings, sufferings and death, and as continuing living Lord, *is the effect and effectuating power of the sovereign free forgiveness of God.* This is Christ's relation to salvation. He must needs live, teach, suffer, die, and live again, in order fully and efficiently to do his work of effecting the free forgiveness of God in man.

VI. THE MORAL REQUISITES IN GOD TO SELF-CONSISTENT FORGIVENESS

We have said that forgiveness must be conditioned by God's holiness and must effect the moral renewal of man. What

now can we rationally think that the nature and being of God require in order that he may self-consistently forgive?

1. *Negatively.*

(1) Neither holiness in God, nor sin in man, can be conceived to require a placation of hatred, or satisfaction of anger or appeasing of vengeful spirit. These we cannot predicate of God, because we cannot conceive as moral or holy in him what is immoral and unholy in ourselves.

(2) Not the exaction of suffering for sin; for, as we have seen, suffering can have no final moral meaning or value either to God or to man, except as a means of recovery from sin. The only moral aim in the punitive is reformation, which is achieved in turning man away from sin. *God's self-consistency has been maintained not in the suffering of the sinner, but in the salvation of the sinner from sin.*

(3) Not the blood of a victim sacrifice, i. e., for the sake of the blood. Whatever placation God may be conceived to need, *blood as blood* is not the means. The blood is but the symbol of the moral act of the devotion of the life to God.

(4) Not anything by substitution; for God does not require anything moral by substitution. The only things that he can be conceived to require are moral, and are to be rendered by the moral person himself. No dealing with sin outside the sinner himself can do more than postpone the real problem of saving *him* from sin; and no righteousness is of avail to man unless achieved by Christ in the man and by the man in Christ.

2. *Positively.*

We may rationally think that in order that he may self-consistently forgive, the holy love of God requires of him:

(1) That he reveal the reality and horror of sin, showing what sin looks like in his view; that it is always despising, wounding, and crucifying love; that is, show sin in its damnable character.

(2) That he reveal that he not only abhors sin, resents it, and hates it; but that he must and will suffer defeat of his purpose and the disappointment of his love rather than condone sin.

(3) That he thus pass judgment on sin, condemning it in an exhibition of its results on a sinless one, as is done in the crucifixion of the sinless Saviour.

(4) That he suffer in himself the sin of man, even the pain and shame involved, rather than pass it by in achieving the purpose of his love.

(5) That he reveal the reality and beauty of holiness and love, which can be done only in a personal life. For men do not love goodness till they see it in a lovable person. Principles and precepts cannot reveal the beauty of holiness; and love is fully revealed only in a sacrificial life.

(6) That he produce in the human race the perfect life in actual historic conditions, in order that his revelation may be clearly made in terms of human personal life, as in Jesus; and that he set the seal of divine approval on that holy life as in the resurrection of Jesus.

(7) That he reveal totally the facts of his righteousness and that his love is ever holy.

(8) That he renew man morally, so making forgiveness good in man.

(9) That he achieve righteousness in human life in such a manner as that man, by faith, may have part with God in it; and by his own will confirm it as his own. All that is done in salvation must be God's doing in man, and equally must be man's doing in God; for nothing can be done *for* us morally by God save as it is done *by* us in God. What God can do, that is of moral worth to man, is only so much as man can accomplish in the power and the wisdom of God.

3. In order that God may self-consistently forgive, we may rationally think that because of sin in man, God's nature and being require that in man be these moral dispositions:

(1) That men recognize and confess the reality and guilt of their sin.

(2) That men abhor and hate sin; and, both in will and deed, turn from it.

(3) That men accept judgment and condemnation on themselves as sinners.

(4) That men repent and turn from their sin, in a word.

(5) That men bear pain and shame of sin for their disciplinary worth.

(6) That men recognize and confess the reality of righteousness.

(7) That men acknowledge the fact of God's righteousness and the holy nature of his love.

(8) That a perfect human life be lived in true human conditions, as in Jesus.

(9) That men trust God's seal and approval on righteousness even unto death, as did Jesus.

(10) That men consent by faith to the will and grace of God working in them as Spirit, that God may achieve in them that which, to man alone, is impossible; namely, their moral renewal.

VII. DOES JESUS CHRIST MEET THESE DEMANDS OF GOD'S HOLY LOVE AS SAVIOUR; AND IN WHAT PARTICULARS?

1. According to all the record of Jesus, he is the issue and the offspring of the holy love of God seeking the salvation of man.

2. He is truly man, bone of our bone, flesh of our flesh, soul of our soul, and therefore a real representative of our race.

3. He acts for God, and he acts for man. He is, in his personal being and action, "God-in-man" and "man-in-God."

4. According to all the records of him, his manifest, chief, indeed total concern is the holy love of God; *to satisfy it by perfect love and obedience and to turn man from sin to the same love and obedience.*

5. He gave himself totally in all toil, teaching, and suffering to the moral recovery of man.

6. He resisted and resented sin in perfect accord with God, even to the point of suffering and death on the cross.

7. He met the normal demand of God's holiness for holy life in man by his own sinless life.

8. He satisfies the holy and loving purpose in God by offering up his life in the most intimate and spiritual form. That is to say, he laid down his life on the altar for man's salvation.

9. He made the whole and holy offering of his whole and holy self to the will of the holy God. He made the total surrender of his personality by a personal act which required the whole resources of his personality.

10. He thus set the approval of his life in its totality on righteousness.

11. He met the historic crisis of incarnate holiness in close quarters with incarnate sin and satisfied the eternal necessity in God's nature to condemn sin and approve righteousness. Man and sin in man are historic facts, in historic conditions. Jesus' work can meet the situation of sin in reality therefore only in historic conditions. What is eternal in the purpose of God therefore must be realized, or achieved in historic conditions. Jesus obeyed the necessity of the actual historic and spiritual condition; obey on a universal scale the moral requirements of the grace of God. He met the situation which arises when holiness meets sin to conquer it. Holiness must condemn sin where it is—in man. To save man from it, Jesus took its judgment on himself. He actually, historically, met the necessity created by sin; actually bearing its woe and actually giving himself, with all the power of his personal life, to the moral renewal of man.

12. His death was a function of his life freely offered and *was critically necessary to his whole saving service.*

13. He is thus enabled to exert a moral influence which

leads men to repentance, and he offers a genuine and real exhibition of redemptive divine love.

14. *He comes again, as an indwelling Spirit, to inspire and renew men morally; and to be in them the wisdom and the power of God for a complete salvation.*

VIII. IN WHAT SENSE DOES CHRIST'S REDEMPTIVE WORK AVAIL FOR US PERSONALLY AND INDIVIDUALLY?

We answer that Christ's saving work avails for us when, by repentance and moral faith, we identify ourselves with Christ. By moral faith we mean a faith that carries the assent of our moral personality, the consent of our will. In virtue of this faith, Christ, as indwelling Spirit, can make spiritually and morally real in us all that he achieved in history. What Christ thus does for us, or what we do by faith in Christ, brings us into conformity with the moral necessities in God's nature; and so enables him self-consistently to forgive our individual sinning. For as sin becomes ours in a responsible way only by the will to sin, just so salvation becomes ours, in a personal and individually effective way, only by the will to righteousness; that is, by the identification of ourselves with Christ in the power of Christ's Spirit.

For if salvation is to be moral, human personality must remain integral. God can do nothing moral in our stead. Anything he does may be "for" us, or "on our behalf," only when it is done "in us" in such a way as that we ourselves can do it; because any action morally related to us can in the final analysis be done only by us. Man, of himself, is utterly unable to make complete moral recovery of himself; and God may do it in man only in such a way as that man can do it in him. This moral correlation is necessary on our part, in order that what Christ did "on our behalf" may be achieved "in us and by us"; may be our salvation in personal and individual reality. This correlation is made by the personal will of the man, the consent of his faith (which is primarily the consent of his will) to all that

Jesus Christ does and seeks in us. The race salvation, potentially achieved in Christ, becomes ours individually when we personally are united to Christ by the Spirit of God through faith.

Such is the central conception and necessity of personal salvation. It involves the activity of the divine life of Jesus Christ in us and the consent of our faith in him. Its processes and achievements are ordinarily conceived under the doctrinal forms of repentance, faith, regeneration, and sanctification; in which we see the work of Christ being divinely wrought and personally achieved in man. *That is to say, these are the continuing saving service of Jesus Christ, not the consequents of his service, conceived as finished on the cross.* In repentance and faith, regeneration and sanctification, we witness the saving service of Jesus continued; now as it is individualized in personal salvation. It is still Christ's saving service as he is present and active spiritually in man; his work in which actually our moral renewal is achieved; and the sovereign free forgiveness and grace of God are made real in us.

A FORMULA FOR CHURCH UNION

JOHN M. MOORE, D. D.

Executive Secretary, Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, New York.

THERE was a time in American church history, not so long ago either, when the denominations in their relation to each other were frankly antagonistic and intolerant. Each of them, large or small, considered itself the custodian of some essential aspect of Christian doctrine or organization without which no other group could quite qualify as a genuine Church of Christ. Most of these denominations looked forward to a time when their own particular interpretation and practise would become universal. It was necessary therefore to oppose each other as perverters of the truth of Christ, or at least as incompetent to proclaim that truth in its fulness.

The policy of intolerance was succeeded by one of isolation. No longer did it seem necessary to attack other denominations, but not yet did it seem desirable to have anything to do with them. And so each church developed its program and went forth to conquer the world just as though there were no other churches engaged on the same task and with equal consecration and concern.

At last isolation began to be succeeded by appreciation and the beginnings of comity. It became increasingly difficult to ignore the existence of other churches; and at the same time the competition which had come down from the old days of intolerance and which the period of isolation did nothing to modify, became itself intolerable. Comity was a great step in advance, but it was not enough. Merely keeping out of each other's way falls far short of being a sufficient strategy for the conquest of the world. To comity there was added cooperation.

During the last twenty years the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in the country as a whole and the federations or councils of churches that have sprung up in scores

of cities have been developing a technique of cooperation. Through these federations, the churches have actually been working together upon common tasks that were quite too large and too difficult for accomplishment in any other way. The question that now presents itself is this, Are we ready to take another step in the evolutionary process from intolerance through isolation and comity and cooperation toward the vital spiritual unity for which Christ prayed? May it not be possible now to develop a new philosophy and take a long advanced step?

Certainly something must be done and that without delay. In the presence of appalling human suffering and wrong against which the united voice of the church ought to be heard and its united ministry directed, in the light of the economic and spiritual waste of sectarianism, which plants and perpetuates churches beyond the ability of many communities to support them adequately, with corresponding neglect of other communities, in the face of that constant misrepresentation of Christ and his cause which our sectarian competition is impressing on the world, and the scandal that results from it, and in the growing conviction that sectarianism means increasing inefficiency and powerlessness at a time when our united strength needs to be at its maximum, the laissez-faire policy must be utterly abandoned, and no mere temporary makeshift will suffice.

All Christian believers accept the authority of Jesus as fundamental to any sort of church unity that would be at all acceptable. Even though there would still be many open questions as to just what Jesus requires, the frank acceptance of his Lordship with freedom of interpretation of his words ought to furnish a basis for unity.

A new appraisal is being made today of the task of the church in the light of a restudy of the teachings of Jesus. That task includes the transformation of the individual by the power of the Spirit of God. Indeed such individual transformation is fundamental. The production of good

men precedes and conditions the making of a good world. But the gospel of Jesus is the gospel of the Kingdom, good news of a new social order that is to take the place of the present world, a kingdom of heaven on earth. They who see Christ's vision of a new earth wherein dwells righteousness are concerned that every aspect of human life shall be redeemed. They are interested not in the souls of men only but in their bodies, their minds, their homes, their health, their happiness. They claim the world for Christ, every last man and woman and child in it, but they also claim every element of the social fabric in which men's lives are knitted together in love, in play, in toil, and in social control. They seek not only the spiritual renewal of every human life but the spiritual reconstruction of every political, industrial, economic, and cultural agency through which the common life of men finds expression.

And that means that a program of social evangelism must be developed which aims to save and to socialize not only every member of the community but the life of the community itself. A religious educational strategy must be developed that will undertake to reach every boy and girl for the Christian way of living. A concerted attack in the name of the brotherly Christ must be made on racial and national hatreds, poverty, exploitation, war. Paganism is as great an obstacle in the way of the Christian kingdom today as in the days of the earliest Christians. For pagan ethics Christian ethics must be quickly substituted. In the face of these conditions and tasks a divided church is hopelessly inadequate. It is cooperation or collapse for church and for society.

But it is not the inefficiency of our present organization that most condemns it. The chief indictment that can be brought against a divided church is that it is a continuing denial of the essential genius of the message and mission of Jesus Christ. With him, the whole of religion could be comprehended in a single word—"fellowship." He came to break

down barriers, to promote understanding, to create fellowship between man and God, and between man and man. To say that with Jesus fellowship comes first is to indicate his whole philosophy of religion. "If thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee; leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift." Imagine the shock of this word of Jesus as it must have been felt by those to whom it first came. They had inherited a system of worship in which the altar was central. And Jesus is saying that a broken fellowship is of greater concern to God than sacrificial blood on the altar! Worship can wait. Opportunity to bind up a disrupted fellowship is something that cannot be postponed.

Dip into the Gospels where you will, walk with the Master by the way, join the congregation to whom he speaks on mountainside, by lakeshore, or in the synagogue; or sit with him in the inner circle of the Twelve. The sins he denounces are sins against fellowship; the exclusiveness of the praying Pharisee in the Temple, the devouring of widows' houses, readiness for revenge, reluctance to forgive, contemptuous treatment of women and children, race and class prejudice, sins against the home, the use of violence—these are the sins against which his righteous anger blazes. In like manner, the virtues he commends are those of fellowship: Blessed are the poor in spirit (what is so destructive of fellowship as the know-it-all spirit of the self-righteous?), the meek, the merciful, the peace-makers, the patient who turn the other cheek and go the second mile if so be that fellowship may be preserved. He endangers his own reputation for the sake of the values of fellowship with publicans and sinners in the houses of Matthew and Zaccheus; with unfortunate women sinned against as well as sinning; with lepers and other such outcast folk whom the pious and the prudent were wont to avoid.

The call to fellowship is not simply a call to that which is

seemly and beautiful and Christian—it is the remedy of God, the only cure for what would otherwise prove to be a fatal malady of mankind. Nationalism, the partisan spirit, divisive measures and agencies are destructive and deadly. The hope of the world rests on Christ's gospel of fellowship with God and with men. They are the enemies of God above all others who sin against fellowship. The peacemakers are God's children. This being true, the church must banish sectarianism, for how can it bring unity to a torn world and create fellowship in industry, in domestic and international politics, in community life, if fellowship cannot be expressed in the life of the church itself?

Most of us have been assuming that whatever church union may be coming in the providence of God certainly lies a long way in the future, and that the best that we can do now is to promote those personal and ecclesiastical contacts through temporary agencies that will fulfil some of the essential responsibilities of the churches, promote acquaintance, and prepare the way for that "far-off divine event" toward which our Christian history moves.

What if it were to be discovered that there need be no waiting? That church union is now possible for those who desire it, on terms that will fully answer the heart cry of our Lord in his great prayer, and at the same time preserve every essential liberty which we now enjoy?

More than one student of this problem has referred to the political history of the United States as furnishing for us an analogy that is at least instructive. Professor D. C. Macintosh in an article on "Baptists and Church Union" in the *CROZER QUARTERLY* makes such reference as does Professor William Adams Brown in his book "The American Church" and Mr. Clarence Athearn in "Inter-Church Government." Let us see what it means practically.

The thirteen American colonies were as independent of each other as any thirteen European states then or now. At the

end of one hundred years, more or less, of colonial history, this policy of independence and isolation where it was not positive antagonism, became intolerable. Without some coordination, the colonies were quite unable to make common cause either in the defense of their liberties or in the conquest of the continent. If they had not been able to produce the Articles of Confederation which served as a war constitution, they would undoubtedly have lost the Revolutionary War. If they had gone forward as thirteen separate States to battle for the possession of the American continent, the history of the past one hundred fifty years would have been something very different from what it has been and probably something very tragic and devastating. The Articles of Confederation served as a bond of union for about a decade but proved to be highly unsatisfactory. Something more than cooperation was necessary. There were two great obstacles however, to any closer union, colonial jealousies and the fear of an overhead government or superstate. These obstacles would have proved fatal to the union project but for the patience and persistence, the faith and the hope of a very few men who were assured both of the futility of the present policy and the practicability of union. Their problem was to secure unity without sacrificing liberty. Any one of the colonies, Massachusetts for example as one of the oldest, might well have said: "We have set up a standard to which all good men may repair. Take our colony as the model or as the nucleus of national life." Over against this proposal, it might have been suggested that a more practicable plan would be for each colony to bring its own traditions and ideals and loyalties, and pour them all into a common melting-pot from which should issue the national life that would comprehend the wisdom and strength of all. There would probably have been losses by either of these methods which would have equalled or surpassed the values gained. Such loyalties and ideals, wrought out as were those of the American colonies, have permanent value and ought not to be lightly surrendered. What-

ever one may say concerning this, it is quite certain that no such solution could have been made operative except through the rise of a dictator. Another way was found. The outcome of years of patient study and earnest argument is recorded in that famous American document which begins "We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union." By that Constitution, they created a federal union of sovereign states. They had secured what Daniel Webster called "liberty and union, one and inseparable, now and forever."

The problem that the churches of America are facing does not greatly differ from our political problem of one hundred fifty years ago. The medieval church achieved unity at the cost of liberty. The reformers secured liberty at the cost of unity. We are endeavoring to find a vital unity which will be compatible with essential liberty. Our chief problems are practically those of the American colonists—denominational jealousies and the fear of a superchurch. Unless the genius of the American people should undergo a complete transformation, no formula for church union is likely ever to be acceptable here that does not guarantee large liberty in the realm of thought and in the method of organization. The abiding values of the Reformation are too highly esteemed, and our Christian liberties were purchased by the fathers at too great a price to make it possible to barter them away for what would prove in the end a spurious unity. Where the Spirit of the Lord is there is liberty. Real Christian unity is born of that Spirit and can never be artificially produced.

It must be admitted at once that the political analogy is not perfect. The State units are geographically separate while the denominational units occupy the same field. This would not seem materially to affect the case. A far more serious difference between the political and the ecclesiastical issues involved centers in the question of authority. It may be said that the precise difference and the all-essential difference between the government of the colonies under the Articles of Confederation

and under the Constitution was the difference in central authority; that the earlier plan failed and the whole union cause would have broken down had there not been granted to the Federal government under the Constitution real authority over the States such as it is not now reasonable to expect the denominations to grant to any central organization of the churches. It is also to be remembered that a four years' bloody Civil War was fought to decide what was involved in "States' rights," that the peaceable withdrawal of a State from the Union was thus declared to be impossible, and that the delimitation of the respective spheres of Federal and State authority is not yet settled but is at this very time a highly debatable question.

It must be granted that it would be unreasonable to the point of absurdity to propose a union of the churches that would be in any sense coercive or from which the peaceable withdrawal of any group would at any time be disallowed or such disaffection punished. To carry the political parallel to this point would be to undo the Reformation and bring back the old days of persecution. Certainly too the effecting of a federal union of the churches could not be easily accomplished. There would needs be years and perhaps decades of patient experimentation before anything more than a tentative delimitation of spheres could be effected. The answer need not be the same for all communities, nor would it necessarily be the same for any community from year to year. In the national field it would doubtless prove as true of the United Churches of America as of the United States that the pendulum would swing from one emphasis to the other, and doubtless the friends of freedom would need to be on their guard lest liberty be despoiled. This must ever be a matter of major concern. The danger for liberty, however, would not be so great at the beginning of the experiment when the more serious problem would be to do justice to the demands of unity.

But it is of first importance to remember that the religious problem would be of a very different nature from the political

problem, that is if the churches were true to the spirit of the Reformation and the essential genius of the gospel of Christ. It would not be a question of authority as with the state, but a question of service. "Call no man lord," he said. "He is the greatest among you who is servant of all." The problem for the churches would not have to do with questions of worship, or sacraments, or denominational organization, or authority over the consciences of men. All such questions would of necessity belong within the sphere of what in our political analogy are included in States' rights. The central organization would operate in such fields of service as were recognized to be common to all and for which it was given responsibility by the churches that constituted the union. In the beginning of the new era "States' rights" would be accorded a large place, and it would continue to be so until the constituent units of their own accord were ready to enlarge the sphere of central or federal responsibility.

To some of those who are most eager for church union this would seem to be no union at all. They seek a unity on the basis of a common confession of faith or a common historic organization. But surely they may be expected to cooperate in securing federal union if they can be shown that it is at least moving in the right direction, and that there is nothing barring the way to a more perfect union if such shall appear to be possible when we have taken the first long step. On the other hand, it may well prove true that the moral authority of such a federal union with its safeguards thrown around highly prized liberties may prove to be quite sufficient to produce an effective instrument for the spirit of Christ and for the expression of our vital unity in him.

These two things are particularly to be borne in mind in considering this proposal. Experiments may be made with units of varying size. If this formula will work at all it is equally well adapted to a village with its two or three churches, to a city large or small, to a State or to the nation. Only by

patient experimentation and comparison of results obtained, failures as well as successes, can the validity of our hypothesis be established.

And this is to be remembered above all things else. Something must be done. Protestantism is at the crossroads. Our essential oneness in Christ our Divine Lord and Master must be far more adequately and visibly expressed or we are lost. But that expression must be given in terms that will harmonize with his own ideals. The freedom of the soul must be preserved, and the unity of the spirit must be achieved and kept. These two ideals are not mutually exclusive but beautifully complementary. We seek liberty and union. When we all become one, a brotherhood of free men, the world will believe.

WHITHER BOUND IN MISSIONS?¹

Professor HENRY C. VEDDER

Chester, Pa.

PROTESTANT missions begin with the landing of Bartholomew Ziegenbalg in the little Danish colony of Tranquebar, in July, 1706. They received a great impetus in 1793, when William Carey began his work, another in 1813, with the opening of the mission in Burma by Adoniram Judson, and a final impulse about 1875, in consequence of the explorations of Livingstone and Stanley in Central Africa.

It is, however, little more than a hundred years since all Protestant churches were awakened to undertake in earnest the fulfilment of the Great Commission and to attempt seriously the discipling of all the nations.

The result of a century's labors, so far as they can be statistically expressed, is that there are now 236 distinct organizations engaged in foreign missions, maintaining 18,000 missionaries, besides 150,000 native helpers, who report nearly 2,500,000 baptized and communicant converts and an enrolment in Christian communities of over 5,000,000.

A host of colleges, theological schools, high schools, primary schools, hospitals, dispensaries, asylums, and other philanthropic institutions are carried on in connection with these missions, with staffs of teachers, physicians, nurses, and other workers. To carry on this great and various work, the Protestant churches now make annual contributions amounting to nearly \$50,000,000.

I do not need to state that statistics are a most inadequate measure of the progress of Christianity in any country, including our own. Much more important than mere figures are answers to such questions as: How are the people affected

¹ Except in similarity of title, this article has no relation to the excellent, very suggestive book, by Daniel Johnson Fleming.

intensively as to character, independence of thought, power and variety of self-expression? Are their ethical ideals elevated, is their conduct progressively in better relation to their ideals?

Even if we confine our attention to numbers exclusively, it is quality rather than quantity that really counts. Are missions making satisfactory progress among the people of highest character and most social weight in their respective countries? "Conversions" and "baptisms" tell no more than half the story, and often the less significant half.

If we apply any one of these tests, better still, if we apply all of them in turn, we can hardly escape the conclusion that Protestant missions come little short of being a splendid failure. We must face the facts bravely and not attempt to deceive ourselves. When the figures given are analyzed and compared with statistics of material progress throughout the world, we perceive at once that missions with every decade are falling further behind.

To take India and China as examples, more heathen babies are born every year by several hundred thousand than we are winning converts. We are not keeping up with the natural increase of the population, and Christianity is numerically relatively weaker today than it was a hundred years ago. The numerical test is not the only one, but it is doubtful if we can reach any better result by any other test that we may apply. We have not yet succeeded in making a dent in the religious life of India and China. And oh, how we hate to face this fact and admit it even to ourselves, much more to the outside world.

And I have not yet stated the worst factor of the situation: Every day it becomes more doubtful whether we can hold the comparatively little that we have won. We take up our morning newspaper with a little shiver of apprehension, half expecting to read that some great disaster has befallen our missions and missionaries in China.

Changes in that once changeless land have been taking place with a breath-taking rapidity. In a single year we have seen extra-territoriality, gunboat protection for missionaries, special privileges for Christians, foreign control of educational institutions, vanish like Hans Breitmann's famous "barty" into the *Ewigkeit*. Some of the Boards and executives are not yet conscious of the fact that these things are dead past all possibility of resuscitation, but they will wake up presently and, like the other Rip Van Winkle, find themselves in a new world, having to do with a totally new China.

What has already happened in China is beginning in Burma, in India, in all our older fields of missionary effort, and what we are trying to regard as a mere local phenomenon is rapidly becoming a world problem.

The fast rising tide of national consciousness leads naturally to a demand on the part of native Christians for more control, greater initiative; they desire to determine their own missionary policies and to conduct them in their own way. At first there was complete supervision and direction by missionaries; later there has been joint responsibility of missionaries and natives; now there must be full native control and responsibility.

The process of devolution should be hastened as much as can be done with safety, and perhaps more rapidly than appears safe to the more conservative missionaries and Boards. If we hesitate much longer about this matter, the native Christians will save us further trouble by taking the matter into their own hands and doing for us what we should have wisdom and courage to do for ourselves.

Our great Protestant missionary enterprise has reached the parting of the ways. If we continue it on the old lines, as originally projected and so far prosecuted, we are headed for disaster. Our Asiatic missions are our oldest, and in every one of them the old objectives, methods, attitudes, have practically ceased functioning.

Can we discern the signs of the times? Are we capable of devising new methods? Are we willing to change our attitude? Or does the crisis find us so lacking in spiritual apprehension, and in mental flexibility, that we shall prove unable or unwilling to change until it is too late?

These are questions which are pressing on us for answer. And in order to find the right answers to them, we need to be better informed. We must know our mission fields better, we must have a clearer vision of what has actually been accomplished, and of what remains to do; we must come into closer touch with the peoples to whom we are trying to give the gospel, and apprehend better their state of mind.

Unless we do this our missionary policies will miss the mark, fail of adaptation to the conditions of our fields, or at least meet with only partial success, but far more likely with ignominious failure. And once more let me emphasize the exceedingly important fact that time presses, that decisions must be made quickly, or we shall wake up some fine morning to find that we no longer have missionary problems to solve—that the march of events has furnished a solution, and in all probability one that we shall not like. But it will be too late then to propose a better.

Whither bound?

The good ship Missions is headed for the rocks and shipwreck unless we proclaim to what we are pleased to call the heathen world a new gospel; or, if you prefer, a new interpretation and application of the old gospel.

The people of the Orient do not react favorably to the old collection of theological guesses and speculations that have long been miscalled the gospel. Missionaries tell us that these people rarely have a religious experience that begins with a deep conviction of sin.

The truth about God, his universal Fatherhood, his boundless love for all men, makes the first impression—there is nothing like that in any of their religions. The life and character of

Jesus and his redemptive love wins their hearts and stimulates response.

Afterwards, with the growth of Christian character, comes an increasing sense of sin; and so the need of pardon and reconciliation with God, the mystery of the Cross, are gradually realized, but it is Jesus and the charm of his personality, the appeal of his ethics to their moral consciousness that chiefly moves the Oriental mind.

The objective of missionary effort thus far has been the establishment in the Orient of churches, with organizations, sacraments, and theologies exactly like those of our own land. We have assumed that to be synonymous with the progress of the Kingdom of God. We have narrowed down the great enterprise of making the kingdom of this world the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ into a mere process of sectarian propaganda.

Think of it: 236 separate organizations hard at work at the job of making proselytes, each to their particular brand of "Christianity"!

How well we are fulfilling our Lord's scathing words to the Pharisees of history: "Ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte"; let us beware lest we deserve the rest of his condemnation: "And when he has become so, ye make him twofold more a son of Gehenna than yourselves."

The gospel of the Kingdom of God is the need of the Orient today, as it is the need of the rest of the world. Jesus did not come to men in order to "save" a small remnant of humanity into a heaven of everlasting bliss; he came to transform life upon this earth into a society of righteousness and peace, as the only possible preparation for future bliss. This is his gospel of the kingdom.

Ministering love was the keynote of his life, and to live a life like his is the goal of every disciple. The people of the Orient understand this; they see that the teaching of Jesus, his principles of redemptive love, his theory and practise of univer-

sal brotherhood, is the only teaching that promises solution of the world's problems.

But the Orient looks westward and sees how little the so-called Christian nations are practising the teachings of Jesus, and it is saying today, "We are ready to take Jesus as our guide, but we will have none of your Western Christianity."

The Orient sees that the two are not only separable, but actually separated.

Can we see as much? Are we ready to admit that such is the case? Having admitted it, shall we be willing to go on to the necessary conclusions and make the readjustments demanded?

In other words, are we willing to have the Orient accept Jesus and reject what we call Christianity? Can we permit the Orient to interpret the Oriental Jesus for itself? Can we not only look on at the process of working out an Oriental form of Christianity, in accordance with the Oriental temperament, intellectual proclivities, and inherited civilization, but contribute as best we may to the process and look upon the result with sympathetic appreciation?

The theology, the ethics, the organization, the rites of such a religion may differ incalculably from our own—will almost certainly do so—and it will test to the uttermost our love and our sympathy and above all our tolerance merely to witness this process. But to share in it and to rejoice at it will demand virtue almost superhuman.

Certainly Western Christianity has never yet shown enough likeness to its professed Lord to grant its tolerance to those who are so far from "following with us."

Everything depends on whether we put Church above Christ, whether we think it more important that the Orient shall accept Jesus and follow him in its own way, than to accept us and our interpretation of Jesus.

The Orient is conscious of its need of Jesus to solve its new social problems. Thousands of workers have moved from

villages to industrial towns in the last few decades. Large corporations are taking the place of former small industries; few laws protect laborers or safeguard women and children.

The Orient is suddenly having to face the very problems that have so agitated Europe and America for a generation or more, and the crisis is the more acute in that the social and industrial changes are so much more rapid in the East, and among a people unaccustomed to rapid changes.

To Christianize and humanize industry is now a world problem and the teaching of Jesus is the only hope. Are Christian missions equal to the task? Can we furnish missionaries who have been trained to deal with these social problems? How can we send out men who have the social mind demanded by the situation, when we ourselves are so lacking in the social mind?

Our churches and ministers at home, with few exceptions, are shirking these problems. Can we give to the Orient something that we do not ourselves possess? Will our Boards tolerate the preaching of Jesus and the Kingdom better than the churches at home?

And is it not notorious that at home any preacher or teacher who ventures to speak the truth about our social conditions and the application to them of the teaching of Jesus, does so at peril of losing his job every time that he speaks?

We may well ask, "Whither bound?"

If the missionary enterprise is to avoid disaster, we must learn to approach our task in a different frame of mind from that of the past. A condescending, pitying sort of piety has motivated our missionary activities, and it has proved all but our undoing. Our missionary hymns are defiled with sentiments like these:

Can we, whose souls are lighted
With wisdom from on high,
Can we to men benighted,
The lamp of life deny?

That hymn was written by a missionary, a great missionary, and it makes quite plain why missions have been a comparative failure. Unconsciously the missionary has made his approach to the people as one above them, fully persuaded in his own mind that he represented a superior religion, a superior civilization, a superior race. If he succeeded in suppressing outward manifestation of this feeling, which is very doubtful, it controlled his presentation of his message.

This prevented any wide acceptance of the message. And so far as it was received, the result was to create a sort of native bureaucracy under the missionary's control, supported by foreign subsidies, necessarily leading to native vassalage. The Christianity thus implanted in Oriental countries has been an exotic, an inflated, abnormal development, the nature of which we are just beginning to appreciate.

In the future, if we would be successful in our missionary enterprise, the missionary must work with, not for, or over, but with the peoples to whom they go. In other words, if we expect to win the Orient, we must go over to the Orientals and not expect them to come over to us. It may yet turn out that the success of missions will be less in the advance they make abroad than in the widening of horizon, the purification of motive, the enrichment of life that it has worked in us who have sent missionaries to the ends of the earth.

So an old saying would again be justified: Religion is the one commodity of which the more you export the more you have. From one point of view, we of the West have no religion to spare; large areas of our life are still pagan; the religion of Jesus has made recognizable marks on all our institutions, but it has never yet succeeded in really making conquest of our civilization. It may be that Europe and America are yet to be converted to real Christianity by way of India and China.

The attempt to universalize our religion inevitably tends to the rediscovery and maximizing of the really universal elements of Christianity. Missions, to be fully successful, must become

an international exchange of the best that each people and each religion has to give to the others. Mutuality must be the keynote of future missionary effort. It never dawned on the fathers who began missions that they had something to receive as well as something to give, but we are slowly learning this lesson. And we are slowly learning also that "Go ye into all the world" is more than merely geographical—the gospel must reach all life and all activities or it is no gospel worthy of the name.

One of the unaffected areas, up to the present, unaffected I mean by the spirit and teaching of Jesus, is that in which race prejudice and race hatred flourishes. Race hatred has, indeed, been often taught as Christian doctrine and as "100 per cent. Americanism."

The whole world, and the Orient just now more than any other part of the world, needs the teachings of Jesus to eradicate this spirit from men's hearts and to implant in its stead the idea of universal human brotherhood. I declare as my solemn conviction, as I have often declared it elsewhere by voice and pen, that no man has any title to call God his Father in heaven, unless he is willing to call every man his brother on earth.

However, so rampant is race prejudice today, as well as social snobbishness, that if Jesus were to come to earth again he would have to give up being Asiatic and a carpenter to gain entrance to the "best circles" of Europe and America.

In the antiforeign demonstrations of China, we are witnessing the natural manifestation of race feeling on the part of the Chinese people which Western nations themselves have provoked. There is no more disgraceful page in all history than the one which tells the story of China's treatment during the last hundred years by the Christian nations of Europe. It is the story of continuous and unbroken acts of insult and injury, of robbery and oppression, that makes one blush for his being of the same race and religion as the perpetrators of these outrages.

China did not name the white invaders of their country "foreign devils" until they had richly earned that name by their deeds.

Christian missions are now enduring vicarious sufferings for sins that they had no part in committing. Yet they are not entirely guiltless; they benefited by some of the treaties forced upon China at the cannon's mouth; they accepted special privileges that have been sustained by bayonets and gunboats; and in part they are only reaping what they have sown.

But while we recognize the seriousness of the situation in China, let us not lose our poise and from a condition of indifference pass to one of panic. Newspaper reports have exaggerated the danger to missionaries and the damage to life and property. The state of China is too chaotic for any present safe conclusions. It seems clear, however, that the popular feeling is more anti-foreign than anti-Christian. As Baptists we are fortunate in that Secretary Franklin was in Shanghai at the height of the disturbances, and his cable messages have been reassuring as to the present and future of Baptist missions. Let us await the outcome of the revolutionary struggle in China with patience, and even with hope, remembering that unfortunate country is forced to solve many questions at once that Western nations have been able to take up and solve one at a time. Mistakes are inevitable under such conditions; but we should look at the general trend, which is in the direction of a free, united, and independent China. With this objective American Christians ought to be in full sympathy. And when it is attained, missions should find themselves on a more satisfactory footing than ever before.

Shall we learn from these occurrences the lesson they are so well fitted to teach us—that we must divorce our missionary enterprise entirely from world politics and force, from militarism and capitalism, and do our work more in the spirit of Jesus and less in the spirit of mammon and of Mars? Or shall we drift on into some real and appalling disaster?

ARCHÆOLOGICAL AND CRITICAL NOTES

AMONG the fascinating narratives of work done by explorers in the field of archæological research is that of Roy Chapman Andrews in his volume "On the Trail of Ancient Man"—a story of the field-work of the Central Asiatic Expeditions. The discoveries in the Gobi Desert were of specially notable interest. The explorer thus describes some findings, "Where the Dinosaur Hid Its Eggs!"

Ten million years ago, a goblinlike creature stood on the edge of a shallow basin in what now is called Mongolia. Its great round eyes stared unblinkingly from a thin, hatchet face, ending in a hooked beak. Its head sloped up and back into a circular bony frill, which formed a solid armature over the neck and fore-shoulders. Low in front and high behind, with its nine-foot body ending in a thick tail, it seemed like a horrid, nightmare fantasy. Slowly it waddled down the slope and settled itself into the red sand. And there in the hollow it left twenty elliptical white eggs, fated, though warmed by the sun's rays, never to be hatched. But others of its kind laid other eggs which did hatch, and the dinosaurs lived their allotted span and died.

Were these uncanny-looking, giant creatures akin to similar mammoth reptiles whose remains have been found on the Western Continent? This query is thus answered by the author-explorer:

These would never know that their progeny, after hundreds of thousands of generations, would wander into Siberia, cross the land bridge to America and spread inland from its western coast. They did not know that their offspring would become the most grotesque of creatures, that they would grow to enormous size and develop horns; that the bony frill protecting the neck would expand into a formidable shield, so broad that a man scarcely could span it with his arms.

Yet these things came to pass, and when the fossil bones of *Triceratops*, the most formidable of the three-horned dinosaurs, were found in America, no man knew whence they came. They suddenly appeared completely

developed in the rocks of the upper part of the Age of Reptiles and gave no clue to their family tree.

Doctor Andrews thus describes the first discovery that the huge ungainly creature, known before by its mammoth skeleton, really propagated its kind by the laying of eggs:

It was a brilliant day of midsummer, ten million years after the reptile had made its nest in the sandy hollow, that we pitched our tents on the rim of a great depression just above the spot where the eggs were laid. Since that far, dim day when they were left to be hatched by the Cretaceous sun, hundreds of feet of sediment had drifted over them, and, through the action of the wind, frost, and rain, had been worn away again, leaving them half exposed. Some showed only as bits of broken shell, but four remained intact. They were no longer white, during their long entombment they had changed to a delicate brown.

But were they really eggs? and were they the eggs of the dinosaur, or of some other ancient creature of long ago? The explorer answers:

We realized that we were looking at the first dinosaur eggs ever seen by a human being. We could hardly believe our eyes, but even though we tried to account for them in every possible way as geological phenomena, there was no shadow of doubt they really were eggs. That they must be those of a dinosaur we felt certain. True enough, it never was known before that dinosaurs did lay eggs, but since most modern reptiles are oviparous, it was considered probable that their ancient ancestors followed this method of reproduction. Nevertheless, although hundreds of skulls and skeletons of dinosaurs had been discovered in various parts of the world, never had an egg been brought to light.

How then could the conclusion be reached that these indeed were the eggs of the dinosaur? The explorer gives his reasons for so believing:

These eggs could not be those of a bird. No birds are known from the lower Cretaceous, the geological horizon in which the eggs were found, and all the Jurassic and upper Cretaceous birds were much too small to have laid eggs of this size. The elongate shape of the eggs is distinctly

reptilian. A bird's egg is usually much larger at one end than at the other, because it is deposited in a nest, from which it might roll out unless it revolved on its point. Reptile eggs which are deposited in shallow depressions scooped out of the sand, usually are elongated, and similar in shape to the specimens that we found. These eggs were in a great deposit full of dinosaur skeletons and containing, so far as we could discover, no remains of other animals or birds.

How commendable the enthusiasm, zeal, and self-sacrifice of the scientific explorers as they enlarge the circle of human knowledge from remote corners of the earth; teaching us that eggs do not have to be fresh to be of interest; but that even an old egg may bring fresh knowledge.

FURTHER MISINTERPRETATIONS OF FAMILIAR PASSAGES

THE Book of Job has been universally recognized as among the masterpieces of literature, quite irrespective of its religious message. Naturally, it contains many quotable passages, some of which have entered into the common language and literature of the English-speaking peoples.

It would seem therefore far from gracious to point out the plain fact that many of these passages that have become like familiar friends—and some very precious—have been mistranslated, or misinterpreted. We are aware, of course, that the book of Job has suffered greatly from the hand of the transcriber, the editor, and the annotator. Hence we have the large number of passages that are so obscure as to be almost meaningless; and also the many passages where the Hebrew (Masoretic) text differs widely from the several Greek versions, as the versions also differ among themselves. This corruption of the text is particularly to be deplored in a book of such high literary and moral worth. The message of the writing, *as a whole*, however, is not essentially affected by these textual difficulties.

In preceding issues of the QUARTERLY a number of Scrip-

ture texts traditionally misinterpreted have been pointed out. A few instances from the book of Job follow.

Some of the very familiar proverbial sayings in the book may be cited. "Man is born to trouble as the sparks fly upward" (5: 7). This, C. J. Ball, following the Greek version rather than the Hebrew text, translates:

For Man is born to Trouble
As the *vulture's* brood to soaring.

Professor Morris Jastrow renders the entire quotation thus:

Yet iniquity comes not from the dust ;
Nor does trouble spring out of the ground,
But man produces trouble,
As sparks fly upwards.

Doctor Moffatt uses greater freedom:

Suffering? it springs not from the soil,
Trouble grows not from the ground ;
Man brings trouble on himself
As surely as the sparks fly up.

Not one of these recent scholars has left the beautiful passage intact; and, what is more disappointing to those who love the passage, all then agree that the familiar couplet was not a part of the original writing; but as Jastrow puts it, "was added by some pious commentator."

The expression, "Escaping by the skin of the teeth," meaning a narrow escape, taken from Job 19: 20, furnishes another case in point. Here Ball reads,

To my skin my bone sticks fast
And I escape with my flesh in my teeth,

i. e., with difficulty "like some animal impeded in its flight by carrying off its young in that way."

Jastrow, however, renders the passage,

My bone cleaves to my flesh,
And I am left with the skin of my teeth.

That is, in his emaciation, "only his gums remain." Moffatt prefers,

My skin is clinging to my bones,
My teeth are falling out.

So, the Common Version's rendering, "I am escaped *with* the skin of my teeth" (19: 20) caused the saying, that has become familiar, but never really justified it.

Another rather common expression derived from Job is "He has the root of the matter in him," evidently borrowed from 19: 28, A. V., "Seeing the root of the matter is found in me." The sense of the passage is not that one has in him the essence, or the heart, of the matter, but rather that the *cause* of the trouble, or the *blame* was to be found in him. Job's friends have been insisting that the root explanation of his sufferings was to be found nowhere else than in Job himself. So, Moffatt translates freely,

O you think to run me down
To blame me for my sufferings.

Jastrow regards this passage also a gloss, as not being found "in the original Greek text"—hardly a sufficient reason in light of all the facts. Ball suggests this rendering:

If ye are saying, "How shall we run him down,
And find the cause of the thing in him?" etc.

Among the proverbial expressions in Job is the maxim "The light of the wicked shall be put out" (18: 5, 6 and 21: 17; cf. Proverbs 13: 9; 20: 20; 24: 20). It is a loss that Moffatt incurs when he disregards the graphic "*lamp* of the wicked," נֵר-רָשָׁעִים, for the less expressive translation "How often does he *extinguish evil men*?"

One of the most impressive passages in our common version of Job is the couplet

There the wicked cease from troubling
And there the weary are at rest (3: 17).

Ball keeps nearest to the familiar wording:

There the wicked cease from raging
And there the weary rest.

Moffatt forsakes the older alliteration (wicked, weary) for another (villains, victims) and reads,

There villains cease to rage
And their victims are at peace.

Jastrow, using skilful emendations (which are numerous in his effort at reconstructing the text) by change of a letter or two, prefers the reading,

There where the toilers cease from care,
And the workers are at rest.

But Professor Jastrow himself confesses to "a feeling of pain in proposing a change for the famous and impressive rendering."

No little wit has been expended over the misinterpreted passage, "O that mine enemy had written a book" (31:35). Of course, the reference in the word "book" is to an enumeration of the charges which the suffering patriarch wishes his opponents to indite. So Ball:

That mine Adversary would write an indictment
And set out his case before me.

Or, we read with Moffatt,

Would that I had his indictment,
Whatever my Opponent has against me!

The overlooking of the fact that a number of the expressions in the book of Job are taken from the phraseology of the court, has obscured more than one passage in the poem. We read in A. V.,

How should a man be just with God? (9:2.)

Job, however, seems rather to say,

But how can man win a suit against God?

So, Jastrow. While Moffatt renders it,

But how is man to get his rights from God?
(If God himself does not accord them).

One of the moral heights to which Job rises, in the midst of his sufferings, is set forth by the familiar words,

Though he slay me, yet will I trust in him (13: 15).

The passage is thus given by Ball,

Though he kill me, I will not wait,
But my ways to his face I will prove.

Jastrow translates still differently,

Aye, though he slay me, I tremble not,
For all that, I will maintain my course to his face.

Moffatt prefers,

He may kill me—what else can I expect,
But I will maintain my innocence to his face.

In all the versions, early and late, the inconsistency between "Though he slay me, yet will I trust in him" and its next, the parallel, line is manifest. So Job appears here to be in his, sometimes, defiant rather than in the trustful mood.

How many preachers have taken as their text for sermons on immortality, the words

If a man die shall he live again? (14: 14.)

This question suffers badly at the hands of recent translators. Moffatt reads,

If only man might die and live again,
I could endure my weary part until relief arrived.

Both Jastrow and Ball, however, place the line in question with that which precedes; giving according to Jastrow,

Appoint a time for me and then remember me,
If [forsooth] a man who dies can revive.

Ball renders it,

O that thou
Wouldst set me a term and then remember me
And from death thereafter would revive me.

Last of all, and possibly more important than all the rest, we shall refer to the familiar and comforting passage which the "Accepted Version" has long made dear to Christian readers, 19: 25ff.:

I know that my Redeemer liveth,
And that he shall stand in the later day upon the earth,
And though after my skin worms destroy this body
Yet in my flesh shall I see God:
Whom I shall see for myself—and mine eyes shall behold and not another.
Though my reins be consumed within me.

The margins of the revised versions have indicated that the word *go'el*, rendered "redeemer" is not to be understood as "redeemer" in the Christian sense, but as the "vindicator," the nearest of kin who according to the old Hebrew custom was avenger of the wrong done to a kinsman.

Thus, Jastrow,

Then would I know that my defender will arise, etc.

Ball renders the passage in two flowing quatrains:

For I, I know my Avenger;
At last he will come forward on earth!
I shall see, yet living, El's revenges,
And in my flesh gaze on Eloah!

I myself shall behold Him, not Another,
Mine eyes will look on him and no Stranger!
My vitals are wasted with waiting,
Until my hope shall come.

Professor Moffatt gives the meaning as follows :

Still, I know One to champion me at last,
to stand up for me upon earth.
This body may break up, but even then
my life shall have a sight of God ;
my heart is pining as I yearn
to see him on my side,
see him estranged no longer.

It will be observed from these quotations (which are among the more familiar passages in the book of Job) how very widely modern scholars differ in their conclusions as to the best way to render into English this remarkable book. The causes grow mainly out of the very great uncertainty as to the true text; the original having been tampered with by pious people who were shocked at some of the sentiments of the distracted Job, or by those who wished the book to conform to a later Jewish orthodoxy. It has been the work of scholars to weed out the later additions or alterations in the text, and so to get back to the original writing. Many emendations, however, are mere guesses, when the evidence is almost hopelessly confusing.

One may readily agree with Professor Jastrow, (whose efforts at emending the text are many, and sometimes bold) when he says: ¹

It is not a pleasant task for the critic thus to hold up as erroneous passages in the original book which have not only made their way into the Church and Synagogue service, but which by their beauty and impressiveness have been a source of consolation to countless myriads these two millenniums, sustaining them in sorrow and helping them to bear the ills and burdens of life. The critic must forego popularity. He lays himself

¹ "The Book of Job," pp. 128f.

open to the suspicion of being wilfully destructive of hallowed traditions and long-standing conventions. If he is serious-minded—and the critic is not genuine unless he feels the responsibility of his task—he may himself share the regret of thus being forced to abandon an interpretation of the book of Job to which, in common with his non-critical fellows, he had clung. He must console himself with the deeper penetration that he gains into the spirit of Biblical literature, and the clearer view of the evolution of religious thought and practise among the Hebrews from lowly beginnings to an advanced stage—a stage higher than that reached by any other people of antiquity—and which culminated in a temporary climax in the commingling of Hebrew and Greek spirituality in early Christianity.

When we remember that the aim of the author of Job was to depict the struggle of the human mind and the bewilderment of a soul tossed by the storms of life, by its pains and sorrows, as the finite grappled with everlasting mystery—then, we shall not insist that every utterance conform to later ideals. Or as Jastrow again says:

The original Book of Job as a consistent expression of the questioning spirit is a greater masterpiece than Job as an awkward combination of contradictory points of view, brought about through the conscious endeavor to change the original drift of the book.

NOTES AND CURRENT DISCUSSIONS

MUCH has been written lately on the subject of the nature of human nature, the behavior of human beings, and the possibility of modifying human behavior. Here, as in every discussion, much depends on definitions. Some identify human behavior with physical reflexes, animal instincts and inheritances, and so are pessimistic about improving the human race.

We listened to an interesting lecturer who had won some fame by his writings in the field where biology and psychology touch. He drew for us a picture of a group of baby chimpanzees gathered on the platform before us, and also a baby Darwin as one of the company collected and exhibited for our edification. He proceeded to show that the baby Darwin would react to its environment just as do the baby chimpanzees. The lecturer, however, stopped short of satisfying our intelligence in that he did not explain how it came about that, a little later, Mr. Darwin was engaged in studying chimpanzees, but Mr. Chimpanzee never studied the Darwins; a remarkable family and quite worthy of study. All education is a modifying of human nature, and human nature is the one form of nature which is preeminently modifiable. It is the only one that, in addition to its response to its environment, can modify that environment, and gradually modify its own responses to it.

Professor A. S. Woodburne in his "Human Nature and Education" says:

The end of education may be described as producing persons who will react in the best way to the various situations which they will be required to face. Reacting in the best possible way involves the exercise of choice with reference to definite purpose. We cannot react to every possible situation merely by the exercise of our native equipment. We may be able to respond in a satisfactory manner to the more simple demands of the environment by means of instinctive behavior, but there are

a great many complex situations which the experiences of every day present to us, that must be met by responses that have been consciously learned. Now the great need is to achieve the ability to meet these difficult situations and respond to them as satisfactorily as to the more simple. Many of the more important reactions are deliberately selected with reference to conscious ends. It is the function of education to prepare the person to be able to react appropriately, and that involves guidance in the matter of ends and the means to ends. The school and the home (for parents are, whether they know it or not, just as truly educators as teachers) ought to furnish discriminating guidance to the child, both in the formation and the execution of purposes. The school is thus a training-ground for the development of persons of worthy purposes and appropriate reactions. There rests upon it the obligation to provide for sufficient freedom, and along with that, wholesome guidance to the child whom we desire to educate into a person of right reactions.

The distinguished professor, himself a noted psychologist, who remarked that psychology had long ago lost its "soul," and is now fast losing its "mind," was a true diagnostician as well as a wit. When Aristotle (who may properly be called the father of orderly observation of psychic processes) lauded the study of psychology, there was doubtless no little admixture of metaphysics in his science of mind. No more than a generation ago works on psychology were frankly called "Mental Philosophy." Then came "Mental Science," with its method of introspection. The mind turned in upon itself to try to catch itself in the very act of thinking, feeling, willing. But this procedure seemed much like an effort to study the true nature of darkness by quickly turning on the light—the darkness has disappeared. To study the emotional state of love, by introspection, was to find that love had given place to analysis. But of course memory (and imagination, too) remained to aid in building up this science of mind.

Later, physiology offered its first aid to these somewhat sick, though quite dignified studies. So we had something new in the world, namely, laboratory investigations in psychology, and the birth of the twins, Physiological Psychology and

Psycho-physics. These helped much, for they introduced us to the necessary physical conditions and concomitants of all our thought processes. Teachers talked learnedly of "brain tracks" and "thought currents," and so forth. But the study did not stop there. Nor could it. Today, biology and chemistry are lending their helpful hands, and not only has psychology become an empirical science, as indeed, all sciences must be; but there is a manifest tendency for psychology to let biology and chemistry do it all—to capitulate and turn over the house to these maids of all work.

Mental processes no doubt are all reactions; and reactions to stimuli of various kinds. The organism which responds to these stimuli is doubtless a single unified organism. Physiology, chemistry, inherited tendencies, and all that has gone before to make the individual what he now is, and all his impinging environment must be considered in the study of why we behave as we do. Yet it is surely not unreasonable to demand of the scientific psychologist that he shall not arbitrarily delimit his field of investigation, but shall take in *all* the facts of man's psychic life, if human behavior is to be intelligently interpreted.

THE Bible has been, doubtless, the most influential collection of writings the world has known. It is still reported as the best seller. Other so-called sacred books have severally made their impress upon millions—usually upon people of a single race or of a very few nations, each; but the Scriptures of the Hebrews and of the Christians have influenced many races and have had an important part in shaping the progress of civilization for centuries. Their consolation and guidance for the individual life, as well as their social stimulus, set them apart among the great literatures of the world.

On the other hand, the misuse of the Bible is one of the glaring and lamentable facts of history. A thoughtful scholar and reverent student of the Scriptures said recently, "I some-

times doubt whether, on the whole, the Bible has done more good than harm." Recasting the history of men's use of the Scriptures, he was not sure whether they had been used to real advantage, in the entire sweep of their history, considering rabbinism, scribism, literalism.

The value of a thing does not insure its valuable use. The best treasures may be badly invested. The moral and spiritual worth in the Bible does not guarantee that it will be made valuable to men. All depends on the use men make of it.

The Bible is a straightforward, sensible book, yet men early set to work to derive from its writings all sorts of fanciful conceits; and for centuries, allegorical manipulations of its plain statements enabled men to get from it any teaching their fancy pleased. It is a book, in its best reaches, that strikes the note of universality and of peace, yet men have made it the instrument for division, for exclusiveness, for inquisition and torture. It is a book with the forward look, and yet men have set it up as a bar to progress, both in the realm of science and in religion.

On another page of this issue, a recent book is reviewed which undertakes to teach religion to youth, by means of material from the lives of well-known Americans of the past and of the present. The characters of the Bible have been so thoroughly relegated to a different world from ours—as though they lived only in some unreal land beyond the skies—that some teachers seem hopeless of ever bringing them down to earth, and making them function as real influences in the lives of the young today. Said a young woman, in a party traveling in Palestine, when shown the places where Abraham sojourned and David lived: "Why, I didn't know those were real persons, here on the earth; I thought they were only in the Bible."

One of the most pressing religious needs among the Christians of today is the proper understanding of what the Bible is and what it is not; the eradication of false notions that have

grown up concerning it, the discernment of its proper use in the development of spiritual character, and as a revelation of God's redemptive purposes for man. It is not a weapon; it is not a foot-rule; it is a great Book of life; a great inspiration.

Among the misuses of the Bible is that of making it a substitute for religious thinking. It was never so intended. The Scriptures have stimulated the world's best thought. It is no spiritual anodyne; nor has it a ready-made answer to all our questions. God is too good a teacher to have given us a textbook that has all the problems of life solved for us in advance. No sane lover of the Bible will say of it as the famous Moslem conqueror said concerning the burning of the Alexandrian library: "If these books contain anything not in the Koran they ought to be burned; if they contain what is in the Koran, they are not necessary; therefore let them all be destroyed."

The most serious false use men have made of the Bible is in making it a substitute for, rather than an aid to, the leadership of the living Spirit. Jesus said that his going away would not prove a permanent loss to his followers, because he would send One who would guide them into all the truth. Christians have often used the words of Scripture to stifle the voice of the Guiding Spirit. Sunday schools, missionary societies, temperance societies, and many movements for human welfare were bitterly assailed because no Scripture passage or precedent could be quoted in their behalf. The early followers of Alexander Campbell used, with powerful effect, the slogan: "When the Scriptures speak, we speak; when the Scriptures are silent, we are silent." But the living Spirit which was given to guide into all truth was accorded scant emphasis. Few things would prove of greater gain to the Christian world today than a proper appreciation of the nature of the Scriptures.

Religious books are today among the best sellers. Even sermons, it would seem, are being read by thousands. There is

a revival in the publication of the sermonic output of popular preachers. It must be confessed, however, that many of the printed sermons, though bright and entertaining, are not rich in spiritual values. They lack the note of vastness, the deep seriousness, and spiritual passion that characterize the best preaching of the ages.

The late Principal Forsyth of Hackney College, writing of the current taste in preaching, said of the present-day pulpit:

This is preaching that says everything, that does not impress you with unspeakable reserves, that has not Eternity in its heart. It is lucid, facile, and passionless. It opens no dark doors, lets in no awful sounds, hears from beyond the last river no harpers on celestial harps, has no scars of the moral tragedy and its moral conquest. It has not been in hell. But many echoes of pure love are in it; many winsome ways, and many tender touches of the elemental pities and pieties. It has a special appeal to cultivated women. It is simple, not in the sense that it lights, unifies, and pacifies the whole world, but in the sense that it makes the least call upon those who hear, and most upon hearers who know nothing of a world-trouble. It is perhaps more easy than simple. It seems at times more concerned to adapt the gospel than to preach its fulness, to bring it down to the people's level than to bring them up to it. It does not presuppose habitual use of the Bible, or any solitary experience of the greater sort. Passion and greatness it discards, but its style may have the secret of the happy touch and the just word. It presupposes religion (which is a natural thing) rather than faith as the apostles would have understood the word (which is not a natural thing but a supernatural). It seeks rather to commend the gospel to the natural man than to set the natural man in the search-light of the gospel. It would avoid theology rather than develop it, or translate it, or apply it; for it does not reach those deep levels of the moral soul where the ore is got from which the great theologies were cast in the furnace.

Pulpit orators are not necessarily great preachers. Spiritual insight and moral passion are of the essence of powerful preaching. Pleasing rhetoric is sometimes a handmaid; sometimes a handicap, an impertinence. Augustine, himself once a teacher of rhetoric, said, "God did not use orators to win fishermen, but fishermen to win orators."

WHAT'S WHAT IN THE MAGAZINES

"OUR NEGLECT OF PSYCHOLOGY"

EVEN the ordinary observer of recent literature would scarcely conclude that psychology has been a neglected subject in the past decade or two. Indeed, it would seem that psychology has lately furnished the bladders to keep almost every other subject afloat; and we have somehow been led to believe that we could know nothing adequately till we had studied its psychology.

It would appear somewhat startling therefore to be told by Professor William McDougall, in the *Edinburgh Review* for April last, that in Great Britain particularly psychology is a neglected study, and that nowhere in the academic world has it been accorded proper place; that it is still struggling for "due place and influence in our Western civilization."

Professor McDougall thinks that America's superior economic progress and industrial strength is due primarily to a better understanding, by managers of business and their employees, of the mental processes of one another, and so a more harmonious cooperation ensues. We on this side the water are glad to know of the success we have attained in this regard, and its cause. We confess that our frequent disagreements and strikes indicate we have yet much psychology to learn. It is somewhat refreshing to be told that it is our superior psychological efficiency that is the secret of our success, when on this side we had been led to believe that in our American hustle, our better business methods, or our tariff, or something of that sort, lies the secret of our economic strength. When all is said, however, we must admit that better business conditions are forever contingent upon a better state of mind. This same thing is true also in the sphere of politics, and international relations. It is notably so of the latter. The

problem of international peace is very largely a problem of changed mental attitudes.

Professor McDougall calls attention to the need, particularly in Great Britain, of a better approach to, and use of, psychology by medical science, and by the legal profession and the courts. He sums up the case thus:

The complexity of modern social life has become so great that we can no longer live prosperously by the light of instinct and tradition alone. This complexity has arisen through the discoveries of the physical and biological sciences which have made possible the aggregation of vast numbers of mankind in small areas, have brought all nations and races into intimate contact, have mingled them in heterogeneous masses, and have put at their disposal immense reserves of physical energy, and especially, the means of mutual destruction on a vast scale. While our knowledge of and control over physical forces have made immense and ever-accelerating progress, our knowledge of human nature and consequently our power of self-direction and our power of controlling and guiding the development of others, has remained rudimentary, because the most difficult and important of the sciences, the science of human nature, has not been assiduously cultivated. In other words, while we have vastly increased our knowledge of the physical world and of the physical basis of life, we have not added appreciably to our wisdom.

These are words of solemn truth. We may talk much about psychology, and fail utterly to understand the main-springs of human nature and their control.

E. B. P.

ROMAN CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT IN CHINA

PROFESSOR KENNETH S. LATOURETTE, of the chair of Missions in Yale Divinity School, writes for the *International Review of Missions* for April a suggestive article on the differences between the Roman Catholic and the Protestant missions in China. He gives thirteen points of difference, and concludes that there are some things that Protestants may well learn from Romanists—notwithstanding the latter's weaknesses in many other important particulars.

The first of the thirteen points, as one might have guessed, is the Catholic unity as compared with the Protestant divisions. Fairness, however, compels Professor Latourette to say that Catholic orders, congregations, and societies have often had sharp differences, jealousies, and rivalries, some of which have been prolonged and violent. The Romanist is not so prone, however, to give publicity to these rifts in the spirit of unity. The Catholic has the advantage of having "a center of authority to which all questions . . . can and must be referred." This is absent in Protestantism. The latter's method is flexible, and there is a growing tendency to give the Chinese "the utmost freedom to interpret their faith in terms of Chinese thought, and to reframe their organization," yet Protestantism must "find a means of preserving the loyalty of those in its fellowship to essential Christian beliefs and of perpetuating the essential Christian experience."

A comparison of numbers indicates that while Protestants number but a little over half a million in China, Catholics count two millions and a quarter. The Romanists have been in that land since the sixteenth century, while Protestantism there is only a little over a century old. The growth of Protestantism has been relatively far more rapid in China than has Catholicism during the past sixty years; and those Christians who have risen to prominence in recent years have been largely from the Protestant group. This may be easily accounted for by facts presently to be mentioned.

Another noteworthy fact is that the Catholics have been chiefly concerned with making men Christian according to the Catholic way, and have been less concerned with the attempt to transform "economic, social, racial, political, and international relationships." The social emphasis has been far less apparent in their method of evangelism. Amelioration of the ignorance and backward conditions of the people has been more directly an aim among Protestant missionaries than among Catholic. Catholics and Protestants have both institutionalized their

efforts. The former have built orphanages and churches; the latter hospitals and schools.

Schools have had different aims among Catholics as compared with Protestants. Romanists stress elementary education, and education in the tenets of the church, for the children of the church. Protestants have made the school an agency for reaching non-Christians, and entered the field of secondary and higher education. This has given Protestants more native leaders, and to Protestantism greater prominence in the country, through the student class.

The Romanists have been more careful to send to China men trained carefully in theological studies. As to Protestants, the development of great educational and philanthropic institutions and the multiplication of efforts to aid directly in renovating the community, have brought to China many specialists in education, medicine, and various phases of social and welfare work.

As a rule these are men and women who have had little or no theological education. They usually possess, however, "earnestness of Christian purpose," but many of them "are quite unfitted to lead into the Christian faith a thoughtful, educated Chinaman, or at least are incompetent to meet him philosophically on his own ground."

Professor Latourette points out that a Roman Catholic goes out to the field for life, while with the Protestant missionary the furlough and the summer resort have a larger place. This may partly be accounted for by the fact that the Romanist is an unmarried priest, while the Protestant has, as a rule, a wife and children to consider in his life's plannings.

There is doubtless a difference in the financing of missionary enterprise in the two churches; and the cost of maintaining families is probably greater than the cost of supporting celibates. The Catholic figures, however, are difficult to obtain.

Protestants are more inclined to publicity in their work; they "wash their dirty linen in public and carry on their con-

troversies in print." The Romanists, at least since the eighteenth century, have kept "their differences, their disappointments, and their difficulties largely out of the press and the public eye."

The Protestant undertakes to win individuals without withdrawing them from their non-Christian environment. The Catholic tries to reach families, natural groups, and to control the group-life—families and villages.

Finally, the Protestants

have made much of broadcasting tracts and portions of the Bible. They have depended on preaching and public address, formerly to those who happened to drop in to the street chapel; latterly more in other kinds of public assemblies.

Roman Catholics however,

look with disapproval upon the lavish distribution of the Scriptures. . . Their preaching is chiefly to Christians; there is little attempt to make the first approach to non-Christians in the public assembly; the missionary's attention is largely absorbed in administering the sacraments, in nourishing the Christian community and in supervising the work of catechists and other Chinese assistants, and the foreign priest mixes little with the non-Christian community. The initial approach to non-Christians is usually by catechists.

In the present need of restudying the whole missionary problem in China, this comparative study of Professor Latourette may be of service to those who are seeking a better way of evangelizing the non-Christian world.

E. B. P.

RESEARCH METHODS IN RELIGIOUS WORK

IN the May number of *Religious Education* are found three articles of considerable importance bearing on survey and research work. These papers were presented at the 1927 Convention of the Religious Education Association. The first, "Surveying," by Professor Arthur Swift of Union Theological

Seminary; the second, "Character Tests," by Goodwin B. Watson of Teachers College, Columbia University; and the third, "The Case Study Method," by Dr. Ernest Bouldin Harper, director of the Student Personnel Bureau, Kalamazoo College.

In "Surveying" the writer constructs a technique to investigate adequately the "activities usually found within the functioning of a Protestant church school." The aim is to increase the school's efficiency. Science and common sense are enlisted in solving the problem. A rather heavy and technical program of investigation is developed. Special effort is made to measure the subjective and cultural forces as well as the quantitative factors in the religious situation. Perhaps more difficult than the diagnostic work is the relating of data materials for the evaluation of the school's mission and the making of specific recommendations for the enlarged welfare of the parish. The writer thinks this method can be toned down and made applicable for the study of the small church school:

The survey is a means by which those who, in the field of religious education, even as in the world of business, are convinced that "to mean well is not enough," may, with some degree of accuracy and reliability, discover a wiser and more profitable use of money, time, and energy in the service of the community through the upbuilding of Christian character.

Tests and measurements have entered the area of character-making in schools of education. In 1926 there were contributed in American publications 167 scientific treatments of personality analysis and measurement. Doctor Watson holds out most rewarding expectations for this latest discipline in school policy:

We can measure . . . good manners, ethical vocabulary, knowledge of right and wrong, . . . ability to foresee consequences, to be fair-minded, to be easily influenced by suggestion . . . such behavior as cheating, lying, stealing, aggressiveness, studiousness, recklessness, and ability to readjust in an emergency, etc., etc.

What are the testers finding in their efforts for more intelligent character-making processes?

Careful tests show that the higher the honors won by a youngster for reporting good deeds, the more likely is he to deceive in athletics, games, and school responsibilities. . . We find, for example, evidence which indicates that traits like honesty, deceptiveness, and helpfulness are not unitary. They are not all-or-none. They vary in degrees and from one situation to another. To educate for the different situations is much like educating for different traits. The single trait name is misleading. Again, it seems to be true that there is little relationship between ethical knowledge and ethical conduct, etc.

The writer is willing to grant that the character test scheme is still subject to many criticisms and shortcomings, though he claims for the inquiry a reliability and imperativeness in religious education work which cannot be neglected. It is one among other important techniques for sounding the nature and trend of personality investment.

What is a case-study? "In a word, it is perhaps the best substitute we have for the actual observation of personality in the making." Acquaintance with ancestry and family of an individual, with his heredity and environment, with his I. Q. and physical examination, together with the life history of the person, gives the psychologist the materials with which to construct a complete case-study of the person. Only on the basis of such a homogeneous study of the individual can his life investment be understood and his life problems defined. This seems like a heavy bill of fare for one professional man. Yet it is being accomplished with sufficient degree of scientific award to engage the time and effort of many experts. Professor Harper has gathered case-studies of several hundred persons, studies in varying degrees of completeness. He draws upon this fund of information to illustrate how such religious problems as those of moral delinquency, conversion, inferiority complexes, etc., are precipitated and may be cared for in the individual. To illustrate what educational principles are involved and what

religious values may be discovered, the writer gives the rather complete case-study of a "problem" youth, "Emma Greenly."

S. G. C.

"LET RELIGIOUS EDUCATION 'BEWARE!'"

UNDER this caption two stimulating articles have been published in the *Christian Century*. One, by Dean Shailer Mathews, March 24 issue, in which he made four charges against the practitioners of religious education. A month later Dr. George H. Betts replied taking exception to every count of the Dean; he offered evidence to support the wholesome condition in the professional endeavor of religious educators.

Dean Mathews claimed that the religious educationalist was in grave danger of minimizing the importance of the church as the official vehicle of organized Christianity. Institutionalized faith must survive in order to carry the values of a cult. The educator is more interested in advancing his profession than in exercising loyalty to the church. Doctor Betts drew a comparison between the curricular emphasis in church schools a generation ago and that of today. Whereas formerly religious educationalists had no place for a study of the meaning and import of the church in lesson materials, today not a publishing house, denominational or independent, that has not incorporated considerable content of subject matter to enlist loyalty to the church. "The hardest problem confronting religious educators today is to arouse lethargic churches to an awakened educational consciousness."

The Dean felt that the new discipline was inclined to hide God "behind a smoke-screen of psychology." The new homeo-centric emphasis in religion has crowded back the former theo-centric stress. It is popular to have contempt for metaphysics and to sneer at theology. There should still be a focal place for faith in a cosmic God who is also Father of the human family. The champion of religious education mentioned the psycho-

logical positions of Pratt, Eucken, Brightman, Selbie, Hickman, and Betts to signify that these men make a place for an objective deity in their psychology of religion. Rather than a smoke-screen, psychology has proved "a light revealing the pathway for leading the child to God"; the same discipline has given the child "an almost unbelievably better, nobler, and more attractive God" than the One offered under the ægis of theology.

In the third place, religious education is inclined to revive "the atomistic treatment of the Scriptures." With the life-situation approach to church-school endeavor, men are teaching in terms of immediate and socialized phenomena without giving due regard to the interpretative values of history. The Bible has been shorn of its magic position in the curriculum, and is now subject to reference only as an encyclopædia of anecdotes or illustrations. The second writer claimed that the demands upon the teacher of religion for an adequate acquaintance with Scripture were never so strict, and that no department of religious education in college or university fails to give a large place to Bible courses.

Doctor Mathews claimed that religious education is over-estimating the importance of technique in its policy. The schoolman is more interested in "projects" and "tests" than in the Bible, theology, and social living. Projects often lack wealth of informative material, and tests treat of piece-meal personality; the result, "scientific introspection." Professor Betts invites the timid at this point to go to a typical Sunday school and note if there is a superemphasis on technique! Even so, better technique does not preclude spiritual power. Tests have their shortcoming, but they do serve as helpful tools to measure the amount of information, degree of comprehension, and moral achievement in the learning process.

The Dean claimed the ultimate objectives of religious education should remain: energized loyalty to the church; intelligent treatment of the Bible; the prayer life like that of Jesus;

and sacrificial commitment to him and his ideals of life. With these Doctor Betts agreed.

The writer is inclined to think that each man substantiated his position, in so far as each represented a very definite vocational strain within the fraternity of religious educators. What profession that is working at its appointed task does not represent movements, dangerous and commendatory?

S. G. C.

IN the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. XLVI, 1927, Professor Morton S. Enslin, of Crozer Theological Seminary, discusses the question of the "abrupt ending" of Mark's Gospel. The paper "*ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ*, Mark 16: 8," was read before the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis last December.

The last twelve verses of Mark have been long recognized even by the most conservative scholars as not a part of the original Gospel of Mark. Doctor Enslin shows how slim is the support for the very general assumption that Mark could not have closed his narrative with *ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ*; that the original ending was lost, and a new conclusion added by some editor who wished to make amends for the supposed abruptness of the ending.

Many passages ending with *γάρ* are cited, as well as cases when *ἐφοβοῦντο* has no direct object. Not only is the argument from style carefully set forth, but that of the unimportant detail of the subject matter with which the Gospel concludes (as some have held), is considered by Professor Enslin and regarded as quite inconclusive. Says the writer, in conclusion:

I am not trying to prove that the Gospel could not—or for that matter did not—end differently. My object has been to point out how tenuous the evidence is, and that one of the sheet-anchors (to introduce a figure) has never grappled bottom.

E. B. P.

WHO'S WHO IN THIS ISSUE

PROFESSOR WATERMAN BRADBURY, of the Department of Homiletics in Newton Theological Institution, gives a stimulating discussion of certain humanistic phases of the preacher's work. Doctor Bradbury was pastor in Massachusetts before he came to the seminary as successor to the late, much beloved, Professor John M. English.

REVEREND ALBERT G. LAWSON, D. D., has been a leader both in denominational and in general Christian service for many years. He calls attention to some vital elements in the life of one who would be a true interpreter of the Christ-life to one's fellows.

PROFESSOR SPENSER B. MEESER, of Crozer Seminary, gives an outline of a constructive theoretical statement of the Doctrine of Salvation in a clear and interesting way. If one will read this able statement without the prejudice which historic theories have often engendered, one will appreciate the meritorious character of this reverent effort to express in terms at once moral and reasonable the profoundly mysterious fact of salvation through the work of Jesus Christ.

REVEREND DOCTOR JOHN M. MOORE has won a place of wide influence and respect among Christian public servants of today. As pastor, as Secretary of Missionary Education, and now as Executive Secretary for the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, he has attained a reputation for statesmanlike grasp on the major problems of church life in our day. His suggestions for the bringing to pass a closer union among Christians will, therefore, be read with more than usual interest. He received his diploma from Crozer Seminary in 1897.

PROFESSOR HENRY C. VEDDER needs no introduction to the QUARTERLY readers. He discusses in this number a very live question in his incisive way. While Doctor Vedder has retired from active teaching, his versatile and virile mind will be active in enriching the religious literature of the day.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Rise of Gentile Christianity. F. J. FOAKES-JACKSON, Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge, and Briggs' Graduate Professor of Christian Institutions in Union Theological Seminary, and Lecturer in the General Theological Seminary, New York City. New York: George H. Doran Company. 1927. Pp. viii, 231.

THIS entertaining and readable volume is the outgrowth of a series of lectures delivered before audiences both Christian and Jewish. As the title suggests, the purpose of this book is to explain the phenomenon that by the middle of the second century Christianity was a thing of the Gentiles, with Jewish Christians little more than a fast dwindling sect, although the ministry of Jesus had been almost entirely directed to Israel, and his earliest followers had been a closely organized Jewish group who looked askance, and often with hostility, toward those outside Jewry.

To outline the contents of the book would be to rewrite it and perhaps to lose its charm. John the Baptist, Jesus, Paul, James, Peter, John, the unknown author of Hebrews, Barnabas, Ignatius, Polycarp, Justin, Tertullian, and Origen all pass in review and speak for themselves. The break between Judaism and Christianity was not, in Doctor Foakes-Jackson's judgment, due to any one incident, such as the fiasco in the early decades of the second century under Barcochba, but was the natural result of a difference of emphasis. The Jew, with his heritage of sacred writings, thought God best served by fidelity to the written law. The Christian, on the other hand, from the first laid his emphasis on correctness of belief. This fundamental difference of attitude, which must eventually lead to a parting of the ways, is admirably epitomized in Justin's Dialogue with Trypho.

To Trypho the Law is a revelation of God's will, and he must act as it directs: Justin has a revelation of the nature of God through Jesus Christ, and he must believe. Such was the situation when Jew and gentile parted, and such has it been for long ages.

While the author has too good an historical sense to minimize this fundamental difference, he yet can hope that

Jew and Christian after their age-long separation may once more unite in the noblest of all efforts, that of bringing man to love and obey God and so hasten the coming of the Kingdom of God upon earth, which cannot be done if they

remain apart in hostile camps, contemptuously disregarding the efforts of the best members of either communion to bring about at least a mutual understanding.

From the nature of the groups for whom these lectures were prepared they are not only not controversial but also non-technical, yet this does not prevent an occasional contribution. In the most interesting discussion of that lost page in Jewish history—the revolt of Barcochba—Doctor Foakes-Jackson challenges the ordinary view that Akiba had played a very significant part in the drama. The evidence that he had hailed the revolutionist as Messiah is much less than has been usually assumed. Far more probable is the conclusion that later admirers of the hero of the rebellion and the revered scholar of Judaism felt they had had more in common than the worthies themselves had realized.

Again, the chapter on Josephus, while not revealing any particularly new facts, yet sets forth in vivid colors the problems that confronted this valiant and gifted, if unpatriotic, Jew. Other points might be mentioned, but perhaps this is enough to suggest the reward of reading this charming little book.

MORTON S. ENSLIN.

The Unwritten Gospel, Ana and Agrapha of Jesus. RODERICK DUNKERLEY, B. A., B. D. London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd. Ruskin House, 40 Museum Street, W. C. 1. (First published 1925.) Price, 8s. 6d.

THIS volume is not to be confused with the outrageous publication "The Lost Books of the Bible" which recently appeared masquerading as containing new and important discoveries, but was actually little more than a reprint of apocryphal books known for centuries. Mr. Dunkerley has sifted the numerous extra-Biblical sayings reputed to be those of Jesus and has preserved nearly 250 that seem to him either possibly authentic or at least preserving some happy Christian touch. A scant few are from the apocryphal Gospels; the majority from patristic writers, variant readings in Gospel manuscripts, recent finds of papyri, and Moslem writings. These he has arranged arbitrarily into groups representing different periods of Jesus' life and ministry. To quote his words, these "are threaded together by descriptive comment in such a way as to tell a consecutive story," and form a collection that may be called "The Unwritten Gospel," that is, the kind of supplementary Gospel which might have been written but was not.

It is to be questioned whether many scholars will agree with the compiler in his judgment regarding the originality of most of his passages, yet the work is of value if only that it presents in convenient form the best of

the early appreciations of Jesus and early comments and paraphrases of words reputed to be his.

MORTON S. ENSLIN.

Getting Acquainted with the New Testament. FRANK EAKIN, Ph. D., Professor of Church History (formerly Associate in the New Testament Department) in Western Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh, Pa. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1927. Pp. xii and 489. Price, \$2.50.

MANY of the books a reviewer reads he reads under constraint. They have been sent by the publisher for the purpose and accordingly he feels under some obligation to notice them. Again, many are so extraordinarily poor that he feels under a greater obligation to warn his fellow readers, who are not on the free list, against spending their money for that which is not bread. When a book does fall into his hands which he can read because he wants to, how great is his joy.

"Getting Acquainted with the New Testament" is decidedly of the latter type. Its purpose is to equip the reader to read with appreciation and understanding the New Testament. It is not an "Introduction" to the New Testament, although it not only introduces one but actually makes him an intimate friend. It is not a popular book about the Bible, if by that is meant, as is usually the case, a gratuitous expansion of the perfectly obvious with studious avoidance of everything that is at all obscure, and the whole interlarded with platitudes; yet it is written in such a style that it is hard to lay it down unfinished.

At all times Doctor Eakin has kept his readers in mind. His aim seems to have been to provide for them everything that is necessary for a real acquaintanceship with the handbook of the Christian Church. The result is that the volume is a veritable encyclopedia. After a brief but happy discussion of the separate writings, in which he is at pains to show the situations which called them into being, the author outlines the story of how these separate letters and pamphlets became assembled and gained the sanctity of Scripture and have come down to us in English dress. Three chapters are devoted to this latter theme and give an excellent résumé of the history of the English Bible, not alone of the sedate Authorized Version, but also of the more sprightly and unconventional grand-children—the versions in modern speech.

Before one can profitably study the contents of the writings it is necessary to see their environment. To this end five chapters are devoted to a review of the historical and political changes in Palestine and to an understanding of the nature of Judaism and Hellenism—cultural and religious—to which early Christianity was so deeply indebted.

The last section considers the contents of the New Testament—the literary characteristics of the books themselves and their values as sources for early Christian history. The discussions of Jesus and Paul are able. Especially is this true of the former. Perhaps the discussion of the virgin birth will seem to some disproportionately long, but in view of the perennial interest that this subject arouses it is probably justified. It will perhaps not be fulsome to express pleasure at the clarity with which the author has treated a matter often left in pleasurable vagueness.

No brief review of this type of book can give an adequate representation. The careful reading of the text is in itself a liberal Biblical education, while the selected suggestions for further reading provide an adequate and thoroughly up-to-date bibliography. While there is no parade of learning, every page bears witness to the competent scholarship of the author. It is just the book the present reviewer has been looking for to recommend to students. He is confident that other teachers will be equally pleased. Nor is its value by any means limited to theologues. It is perhaps not rash to remark that many a pastor today would find his work simplified and his life made far more pleasant if his laymen could be prevailed upon to read it and think its implications through. An admirable book!

MORTON S. ENSLIN.

The Messages of the Books: Being Discourses and Notes on the Books of the New Testament. F. W. FARRAR, D. D., F. R. S. Late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Archdeacon and Canon of Westminster; and Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1927. Pp. xix and 532. Price, \$2.50.

THE Macmillan Company has issued a reprint of this work of the late Canon Farrar (ob. March 22, 1903) which was published in 1885. It is an exact reprint even to an error of pagination in the Table of Contents. The only variations the present reviewer could find were the substitution of the new publishing house and date of reprint, the omission of the verse from I Peter which acted as a motto, and the omission of the words "St. Margaret's Rectory, Westminster, Sept. 1884," which originally stood at the end of the preface.

There is no hint that this is not the latest word on the subject. Some who are interested in archæology will remember that a book of this title appeared forty-two years ago; others will perhaps note the appellation "Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen." It is somewhat surprising that no intimation is given on frontispiece or jacket that it is a reprint.

Of the value of the book itself little need be said. A standard work

in its day, it still is of real value notwithstanding the many discoveries and advances that have been made in the last forty years.

MORTON S. ENSLIN.

Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era. GEORGE FOOT MOORE, Professor of the History of Religion in Harvard University. Two volumes. Cambridge. Harvard University Press. 1927. Price, \$10.00

STUDENTS of *Judaica* have eagerly awaited the appearance of this work. Nor will they be disappointed. It is by no means rash to hazard the prophecy that these two volumes, with the extra volume of addenda now in preparation, will be the authoritative and definite work on Judaism for long years to come.

The importance and scope of this study allow but this brief notice in this issue. It will be reviewed in detail in the October number.

MORTON S. ENSLIN.

The Psychology of Religion. CHARLES CONANT JOSEY. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1927. Pp. 362. Price, \$2.50.

THE author won his doctorate from Columbia University in 1921, writing upon the thesis "The Rôle of Instinct in Social Philosophy." He became at once instructor in psychology in Dartmouth College, and in 1922 was promoted to the position of Assistant Professor. In 1923 he was elected by the trustees of The University of South Dakota, Professor of Philosophy, which position he now holds. His experience as teacher of psychology and philosophy in colleges led him to see the need of elementary text-books for undergraduates. His expertness in the classroom has enabled him to supply the need. He knows the limitations and capabilities of college youth and general readers, and has skilfully selected and arranged his material. A university is to be congratulated that has as its professor of philosophy one who can in untechnical language acquaint its student body with the results of recent research in psychology and the history of religion, and maintain its confidence in the permanent values of religious conception and practises.

It would be well if pastors and parents should decide to read this volume and thus keep company with college youth as they meditate upon religions, belief in God, immortality, conversion, cult practises, preaching, and prayer.

Well panoplied for a noble life is the college graduate who, having mastered the contents of this volume, can conclude with the author:

If religion can attach itself to any view of reality and bend it to the service of human needs, then the question of the truth of religion appears to be one of little if any force or meaning. It is a question that may properly be asked regarding particular beliefs of a religion. Religion here is on the same footing as science. Questions as to a particular finding of science may be raised. But it would be meaningless to raise questions regarding the truth of science. Science as the pursuit of knowledge is not shown to be false by its errors. But religion as the attempt to develop the best there is in man, as the attempt to ennoble and enrich human nature, as the determination to face heroically that which must come—whether it is a doom sent by the hand of God or by the agency of mechanical laws—religion as the means of uniting men into closer bonds and making them more sensitive to the worth of their fellows, can never be shown to be false by reflection on the ultimate nature of reality. Man will continue to be religious no matter how his conceptions of nature may change. Serious-minded men with noble aspirations are going to continue to engage in activities that are religious even though they should believe that tomorrow ends all. To live today with the maximum of their power, to make the present as rich and beautiful as possible—these are ideals that will always animate the loftier spirits of the race.

MILTON G. EVANS.

Prophecy and Eschatology. NATHANIEL MICKLEM, M. A. London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd. 1926. Pp. 248.

For several years The Central Council of the Selly Oak Colleges has been publishing works by its staff, its old students, and associates. This volume on "Prophecy and Eschatology" is the ninth thus far issued and is by one of the editors of the series of publications, who is also Professor of Old Testament Literature and Theology at the Selly Oak Colleges, Birmingham, England. It is time for a new study of Old Testament prophecy. A generation or more ago, in reaction against the view that the Hebrew prophets were predictive of Jesus Christ and Christianity, they began to be regarded as social reformers, as sagacious diplomats, as wise political counselors. The supernatural has been minimized, if not denied. Their religious significance was overlooked in the endeavor to make them men of their own times with a contemporary message and having a contemporary purpose. The result has been of permanent value, in spite of its inadequacy. Recently, under the impulse given by students of psychology, the prophets have again been brought under the category of the "abnormal," not in the sense of being "supernatural," but in the sense of being "ecstatic," a neurotic condition, explicable by the psychiatrist.

Professor Micklem is well aware of the present situation. He knows and accepts the rich fruitage of historical criticism and of the comparative method in the study of religion, especially in the field of eschatology. He is no reactionary, but his own religious experience and his mature reflec-

tion on judgment of scholars on the place of Old Testament prophets in the history of religion have compelled him to call in question many of their conclusions.

The temper of the author may be inferred from a few sentences of the preface:

It does not seem to me in the least degree likely that all my arguments will stand the test of searching criticism, and it does not seem to me a light matter if in any important aspect I should mislead the less critical reader, but I have thought it right to do what I could; and I really believe that this book is more diffidently written than the style of it might suggest. I am not unaware of many technical disqualifications for the task that I have undertaken, but the most serious deficiency seems to me to be religious. It is often only by a great and painful stretch of the imagination that we are able to conceive that overmastering sense of the presence, the power, and the glory of the living God which was as the air which the prophets breathed. It does not appear to me that any interpreter has much hope of success in his task unless he himself be aware of God somewhat after the fashion of the Hebrew prophets.

His profoundly religious feeling is expressed by a paragraph in the closing chapter:

I have insisted more than once that the psychological conditions under which a prophet receives his message do not affect the message itself in respect of its truth. There is an important school today which virtually represents the prophets as being neurotic by temperament and as exemplifying many of the recognized symptoms of hysteria. For the reasons given in the first chapter I believe this to be a gross exaggeration. I have not denied that the prophets, together with many others of sane and balanced judgment, were sometimes subject to tactile or auditory hallucinations; I do not think it is possible or important to define the limits of their *furor poeticus* or *furor propheticus*; but if we ourselves had anything of the prophet's sense of the nearness, the glory, the righteousness, the immeasurable holiness of the living God, we should, I think, be less disposed to think of their symptoms as neurotic. I do not feel free to think that their amazement and appallment was a sacred and picturesque disease. Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets!

Professor Micklem's "Prophecy and Eschatology" should be added to the library of students of the Old Testament. It has eight chapters, which treat of Psychology and Prophecy, Elijah, Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Summary, and Conclusions. An index of Scripture references is a valuable feature of the volume.

MILTON G. EVANS.

Buddhism and Buddhists in Japan. ROBERT CORNELL ARMSTRONG, Ph.D. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1927. Pp. 144.

THIS is the fifth volume in "The World's Living Religions Series" projected by the Board of Missionary Preparation in North America. Its author is a missionary of the United Church of Canada to Japan. He is lecturer in Comparative Religion and Christian Apologetics in Aoyama Gakuin Theological Seminary, Tokyo. Through earlier books on subjects connected with the Far East and specially with Japan, Doctor Armstrong won the attention of readers of missionary literature. His close and sympathetic study of Japanese Buddhism qualified him to contribute a volume to a series of books having the twofold purpose of reliably presenting the actual religious life of the Buddhists of Japan and of Christianity's approach to them.

The author belongs to the early Petrine type of missionary who learned that men not born in their own ancestral religious culture are necessarily "unclean." His own experience has taught him to repeat with a new significance the revolutionary words, "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that fears him and works righteousness is acceptable to him."

Doctor Armstrong has studied Japanese history; he has become intimately acquainted with Buddhist scholars; he has witnessed the actual results of Buddhist philosophy and ritual; he knows the moral ideals of the best and the hopes of the most patriotic; he has the Pauline insight to see in many phases of Buddhism in Japan a preparation for the Christian gospel—a preparation both negative and positive. The result is a book that is an excellent condensation of history, a graphic recital of national and religious development, a sympathetic interpretation of another's religion, and a hopeful prediction of the moral renewal of a people that will more and more contribute to the cultural welfare of the human race. A paragraph from the concluding chapter illustrates the missionary's approach and registers his matured judgment:

The "new wine" which has come to Buddhism through her contact with Christianity cannot long remain in the hardened old bottles of organized Buddhism, any more than the new wine of the gospel of Jesus Christ could be put into the old bottles of the organized religion of the Jews or remain in the non-Christian forms, ceremonies, and practises adopted by the medieval church during its conflict with the non-Christian religions of the Roman Empire. In Christianity, reformation has followed reformation and will continue to do so, until all of these dead forms are thrown off. So in modern Buddhism, the great difficulty is not with the new wine, but with the old bottles which taint it. Organized Buddhism is "hopelessly degenerate."

Only by putting into the "supreme being" a living, ethical-social connotation and receiving the power and inspiration of the Holy Spirit, the spirit of righteousness and truth, can the best elements in the old be awakened, deepened, and fulfilled. To do this, modern Buddhists must cease relying upon empty imitation and accept Jesus Christ as the perfect revealer of the absolute personality and of man. If Buddhists are led by the spirit of Jesus their ultimate reality will cease to be a mere abstraction of philosophic imagination or an academic term, tainted, alas, by their historic struggle to suppress life and desire, and will become the spirit of the Living Christ who is the Holy Spirit of God the Father.

The day is not far distant when pious Buddhists who are dissatisfied with modern attempts to ape Christianity will open their minds and their temples to the magnetic influence of Jesus and his saving grace. It is possible to think of them uniting to support the followers of Jesus in practical community service. Certainly a radical change in the traditional methods of the divided church must come, if the church militant is to serve the masses of any land. The servants of Christ must adapt their methods to serve the needs of the tenant farmers, the laborers, the citizens and those of the entire community in the broadest and most humanitarian way possible. As Jesus "went about doing good," so must his messengers burn with a sympathetic zeal for the good of those whose background and early training are not Christian.

This paragraph, however, can be appreciated to the full only after a careful reading of the entire book. To buy the book is to make an investment rich in returns in pleasure and in knowledge and in definite Christian conviction.

MILTON G. EVANS.

The Life of Prayer in a World of Science. WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN, Ph. D., D. D.
New York: Charles Scribners' Sons. 1927. Pp. 194. Price, \$2.25.

THIS is the best book on the subject of prayer that has been written in recent years. Its author is not only a scholar but a very devout Christian, a professor of theology, in Union Theological Seminary, New York. Its scope is wider than the volume of his colleague, Doctor Harry Emerson Fosdick, "The Meaning of Prayer," which thousands have found so helpful. The wide range of this treatise may be indicated by the five sections under which the subject is discussed: I. The Rediscovery of Prayer; II. The Contribution of Psychology—Prayer as Appreciation; III. The Contribution of History—Prayer as Fellowship; IV. The Contribution of Philosophy—Prayer as Creativity; V. The Contribution of Education—Prayer as Discipline. Each of the aspects is discussed with insight and clarity.

That it is more difficult today to pray than ever before, the author recognizes. But he concludes:

Our way lies forward not back. Not back from science to faith, but forward through science to a more assured and a more satisfying faith. Not back from service to prayer, but forward through prayer to a more effective and enduring service.

The volume ends with this note of faith:

In the last analysis it comes to this: either there is a God, or there is not. Either we are alone in the universe, facing its unsolved mysteries and its appalling tragedies, with only the help that comes from other mortals as ignorant and as helpless as we, or there is Some One who hears when we speak and answers when we call. In prayer we put this supreme issue to the test. Prayer introduces us to the Great Companion who meets our need with his divine response. The man who has learned to pray is no longer alone in the universe. He is living in his Father's house.

EDWARD B. POLLARD.

A History of the Jewish People. MAX L. MARGOLIS and ALEXANDER MARX. Philadelphia. The Jewish Publication Society of America. 1927. Pp. xxii, 823. Price, \$4.00.

THE authors have undertaken the highly difficult but properly ambitious task of telling in a single convenient volume, as the preface states, "the story of the life of the Jewish people, from the dim beginning to the present day." They have done this with the full recognition that everywhere "Jewish history is interwoven with universal history," and that therefore extreme compression becomes a necessity.

The outcome is a book which at once impresses as a marvel both in the comprehensiveness with which its pages move, the mass of information, the breadth of sympathy, and at the same time the essentially popular form of the presentation. It sketches the development of the Israelitish people in its home country, Palestine, its eastern life in the Mesopotamian Valley, its movement through Europe and its later spread over the entire world. These five general divisions are further analyzed into 98 different chapters each of which sketches a particular aspect of Jewish life and may be used accordingly.

In addition to the historical sketch itself, so valuable for reading and reference, there is an extended bibliography outlining the sources of further information, together with a quite unusual set of chronological tables summarizing the entire history, and an exceptionally valuable index which furnishes a key to the contents as a whole.

FRANK GRANT LEWIS.

Birth Control Laws: Shall we keep them, change them, or abolish them?
MARY WARE DENNETT. New York: The Grafton Press. 1926. Pp. ix and 309. Price, \$2.50.

WHILE this volume was published last year the *Book Review Digest* for May, 1927, which gathers up reviews from a large number of the most important periodicals to about the close of April, 1927, does not contain even a mention of this unusual publication. This in itself may be significant. It tends to confirm perhaps the underlying thesis of the author to the effect that there is an apparently systematic attempt to make the subject of birth control taboo.

The purpose of this volume, on the contrary, is to aid in opening the way for people in general to become acquainted with the legal status of the subject at present in order that with such information before them they may then take such action as they wish. Accordingly, as the introduction to the volume states, "the scope of this book does not include any general discussion of the merits of birth control, or its sociological and racial ramifications." It undertakes the entirely different purpose of advising what present laws are, the way in which these hamper intelligent information concerning the subject, and the types of laws which are needed in order that intelligence may take the place of ignorance. Accordingly there is a rapid survey of the situation as it is at present, a sketch of the influences which have attempted to hold the ideas of life in a condition of taboo, the subterfuges which have been resorted to in legislation, the delays which have been used in Congress, the attempts which have been made to limit the field of knowledge and to restrict its distribution through the medical profession alone, and a frank discussion, on the basis of much first-hand information, as to how all this has come about and as to what the people really want.

Apart from any prepossessions which any one may have on the question of birth control itself, it is apparent that here is a volume which every thoughtful person ought to take into account, to the extent at least of finding out what the present laws are with reference to the matter of birth control, and thus coming to a position where it is possible to speak and to act in view of things as they are. Obviously this is the merest duty of every citizen, and until so much information, if no more, becomes general there is slight hope of dealing in any adequate way even with the question of population, still less with the question of what sort of population the world shall have.

FRANK GRANT LEWIS.

The Stockholm Conference, 1925; the official report of the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work held in Stockholm, August 19-30, 1925.

Edited by G. K. A. BELL. Oxford University Press. 1926. Pp. xvi and 791. Price, 12s. 6d.

"WE must learn to think internationally." So spoke, some years ago, an outstanding teacher and Christian leader. His incisive and significant statement came from a keen recognition that most important affairs now have international meaning, and only persons who approach the large problems of life through consideration of their world import are qualified to respond to world needs.

The Stockholm Conference of 1925 developed because a considerable number of leaders in Christian thought on both sides of the Atlantic had become impressed that religion is preeminently an international affair, and that the hope of Christianity and of religion for all peoples is a theme for international concern.

The volume now at hand is a happy and significant outcome of that meeting in Stockholm in August, 1925. The copy before me, as the title implies, is in English. The preface informs that a similar volume is being published in German under the editorship of Dr. Adolf Deissmann, the two varying somewhat in details, both, however, having been planned in close agreement with each other, and the two editors being in constant and harmonious communication.

Something of the meaning of this volume may be observed from the fact that the Conference was composed of about seven hundred persons, coming from thirty-seven nations and representing thirty-one religious organizations, each delegate also having been selected by his own church or fellowship. Pages 21 to 37 are devoted to a list of these delegates arranged by the names of the several countries and the churches represented. This list alone is impressive and at the same time important as a permanent reference source of information concerning the best religious thinking at the end of the first quarter of the 20th century. From the table of contents likewise, covering ten pages and indicating with some detail what was undertaken in the meeting, one receives a deep sense of the basic and far-reaching worth of this gathering for religion as a whole.

There is an introductory chapter which surveys the purpose of the Conference, the steps which led up to it, and its organization. In the body of the volume one finds sermons sketching generous views of Christianity and its work, addresses on the various aspects of religious and social life, discussions of pressing international problems, and fruitful suggestions of methods and means for opening the door to a better day for human experience.

This book, accordingly, is one to be read by all persons who are desirous of seeing the world as it is, of sharing in religious service for the world, and of cooperating with the widening outlook which is now obviously imperative if world problems are to be at all handled with satisfaction and Christianity is to accomplish its true mission for mankind.

Clearly also the volume is highly important as a reference work for those who are interested in world affairs from the point of view of religion and desire to have ready at hand a book filled with important source material. It is to be hoped, naturally, that any who do not yet take the international point of view will be stimulated to use his work and through it come into suitable sympathy with the world currents in religion and other affairs of our day.

FRANK GRANT LEWIS.

Teaching in the Church School. SELDON L. ROBERTS. Philadelphia: The Judson Press. 1927. Pp. 148.

The Pupils in the Church School. ANTOINETTE ABERNETHY LAMOREAUX. Philadelphia: The Judson Press. 1927. Pp. 138.

Christianity a Way of Life and Belief. JOHN W. BAILEY. Philadelphia. The Judson Press. 1927. Pp. 130.

THESE companion volumes represent three texts in the Keystone Standard Training Series of the Northern Baptist Convention. The first treats of principles and methods for church-school teachers and was prepared by the director of leadership training for the denomination; the second makes a study of the formation of the religious personality; and the third constitutes a text for advanced students in Christian education.

Out of a rather wide range of experience in promotional church work, Doctor Roberts gathers some suggestive materials in pedagogy. As his "foreword" witnesses, the writer has been more interested in setting forth popular answers to "problems" which "group after group of earnest workers in need of immediate help" have faced, than in considering in an inclusive and ordered fashion the subjects of teaching skill. Much is made of the "social" nature of education. The section under the title "Teaching is mutual" is stated exceptionally well. "Nothing is ever taught until it is learned." A good introduction is given to the nature of the "project principle"; users of the text should feel stimulated to go on to avail themselves of the readings appended to the chapter under that title. Teachers will find the score card a challenge to measure their resourcefulness for classroom work. It is possible that churchmen would have preferred more of the "Christian" setting in the text.

Mrs. Lamoreaux's book is a serious attempt in a brief compass to put the teacher in touch with those forces that center in the making of Christian personality. In a constructive and progressive character the author unfolds the usual themes included in a course of this kind. Her introductory chapter on motive and objective in religious education is lucid, timely, and interesting. The next three chapters present in popular form some reliable findings in psychology in reference to the nature of personality, and its traits in childhood and adolescence. When she turns to "Activity and the Instincts," she follows the lead of those who teach that the ten-year-old, for instance, can respond instinctively on occasion to a given social stimulus. This confuses the field of "pure" instincts with that of acquired experience based on hereditary equipment. In the remaining five chapters on "Attention," "Thinking," "Emotion," "Habits," and "Character," Mrs. Lamoreaux elects for study divorced phases of personality rather than various conditions of the whole person in changing life-situations. For the purpose for which it is written, there is not an unattractive page in the manual. The "points of discussion" constitute a summary of the textual material.

Professor Bailey was asked by the editors of the series to construct a manual on "the distinctive elements in the message of Christianity." For the author Jesus is the center of interest in Christianity, the composite picture of Jesus found in the New Testament writings. "The spiritual presence of Jesus" made possible the wealth of Christian experience reproduced in the canonical writings. With all this diversity of view-points in interest and belief, there is an underlying unity of faith and purpose that makes all the book a synthetic literature. The God of Jesus is also the God of the Old Testament (p. 25). The death of Christ is the heart of the gospel (Chap. IX). The principles of Christian living are found in the great Teacher's twofold law of love. "In seeking to apply these to our modern living there are three problems that are rated by competent judges as of first importance. They are the family, wealth, and world relations." Hence chapters VIII, IX, X. The approach to these homely issues is illustrated in these words:

The teaching of Jesus as to home and family is radical. If it were put into operation in our homes today it would solve all our problems. . . Utopian, is it? Even so; but that is what we would have (p. 97).

The materials of the volume are liberally supported with Biblical reference texts.

STEWART G. COLE.

Fear. JOHN RATHBONE OLIVER. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1927. Pp. 366.

UNDER the sub-title, "The Autobiography of James Edwards," Doctor Oliver sets out in graphic and very telling fashion the workings of fear in a life that has been for a time mastered and almost wrecked by it. The struggle for emancipation from the fear demon is told by "James Edwards" in the first person. This gives a realistic touch to the story.

Like most stories with a purpose, the lines must be deeply drawn, and many events brought within a compass that is rather too narrow for them. On the whole, however, this book that is evidently intended to preach a sermon, and a good one, a much-needed one, will have wide reading, and do great good. The wholesome influence of a healthy mind over one's body cannot too often be preached. And while usually one may prefer his preaching and his fiction unmixed, yet here the author has given us a good composite. The physician of today is recognizing more and more clearly the medicinal value of mental attitudes. A wise man of long ago said, "A merry heart doeth good like a medicine." Doctor Oliver goes still further, and makes his victorious patient discover that religious faith is conducive to mental and physical soundness; for this book of struggle and of final triumph, reaches its climax in the recognition of the truth spoken by a great Christian apostle: "There is no fear in love; but perfect love casteth out fear."

EDWARD B. POLLARD.

Dawn. IRVING BACHELLER. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1927. Pp. 337.

THE popular novelist, Irving Bacheller, after travels and studies in Syria, has given us an engaging novel, "A Lost Romance of the Time of Christ," piecing out by imagination data derived from a palimpsest that records in Greek events that go back to the reign of Tiberius. By weaving into the narrative persons and dates from the Four Gospels, the author has produced a story of real interest and merit. It is the account of a beautiful Greek girl, orphaned and lonely, who meets a Jewish Christian youth with whom she falls in love, because of his manly character and his kindness to her in time of stress. Later, however, she falls prey to a Roman officer, becomes the "woman taken in adultery" of John's Gospel (A. V.), and is befriended by Jesus. The death of Stephen and the conversion of Paul are woven into the narrative. The destruction of Jerusalem and the incident upheaval furnish the background for reunion of the two chief lovers of the story, after years of separation and tragedy. Those who would have knowledge of some of the conditions of life in the Roman

world in the first century of the Christian era, together with a clean, attractive romance, will find in this story of Mr. Bacheller's a real delight.

EDWARD B. POLLARD.

The Spiritual Ships. L. R. SCARBOROUGH, Nashville, Tenn.: Sunday School Board of the Southern Baptist Convention. 1927. Pp. 135.

THIS is a series of chapters containing materials bearing upon Discipleship, and "the heaviest responsibilities of Christ's people," rather than fully digested and completely wrought-out discussions of the subjects presented. The ten *ships* are, Ownership, Sonship, Debtorship, Trusteeship, Guardianship, Ambassadorship, Fellowship, Stewardship, Partnership, Companionship. In undertaking to transport all these Christian teachings by *Ship*, there naturally seems to be a slight mixing of cargoes here and there, as in Trusteeship and Stewardship, and in Fellowship and Companionship. But the shipments reach their destination—which is the important thing.

EDWARD B. POLLARD.

B. H. Carroll. JEFF D. RAY, D. D. Nashville: Sunday School Board of the Southern Baptist Convention. 1927. Pp. 167.

AN ardent friend, former pupil, and devoted admirer of this distinguished Southern Baptist leader, B. H. Carroll, interprets him with affectionate appreciation. Doctor Carroll was for years the very idol of Texas Baptists; was much admired by Southern Baptists, and too little known by the rest of the world. This warm-hearted tribute by Professor Ray of the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, issued more than twelve years after his friend and benefactor's death, is a striking illustration of how men live again in lives that have been made better by them.

EDWARD B. POLLARD.

The Portion for the Children. REVEREND FRANK J. SCRIBNER. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1927. Pp. 179.

It is not easy to speak well to children. A growing number of preachers are talking regularly to the boys and girls of their congregations, or to a separate Junior Congregation. Fifty-two sprightly and wholesome addresses for juniors are here brought together. Mr. Scribner knows how to use language adapted to hold the attention of children. The topics and illustrations are well chosen and effectively presented.

EDWARD B. POLLARD.

The Radiant Tree. MARGUERITE WILKINSON. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1927. Pp. 170.

A BEAUTIFULLY made book—a work of art, suitable for a gift-book or a “keepsake.” It is more; for it brings together many of the very best short poems on the passion, death, and resurrection of the Master. An introductory chapter undertakes to do what the poems following do in a different way, bringing the reader face to face with the living Christ, the charm of whose presence causes us to forget those habits of thought, forms of service, and clash of symbols that have so often cluttered the way to his presence.

Assuredly there will be wonder in the world again whenever men and women and nations turn from their crosses to their Christ and find in him the rising sap that is food for the Spirit, the warm rain and sunlight of his love.

The book will prove a tonic for the devotional life, a fine antidote for that too prosy, conventional way of taking one’s religion.

EDWARD B. POLLARD.

Christianity: A Way of Life and Belief. JOHN W. BAILEY. Philadelphia: The Judson Press. 1927. Pp. 136.

PASTORS looking for a text-book for use by classes to be trained in the Christian teachings and the Christian’s practical way of living, will find this hand-book of value. Beginning with the historic bases of Christianity as recorded in the New Testament and the early Christian experience, the author discusses the fundamentals of early Christian beliefs, Jesus the Teacher, the doctrine of the Cross, and the central emphases of Jesus’ teaching. The second half of the book is taken up with the social teachings of Jesus and the demand of these upon the Christian’s conduct, in family life, in the accumulation and ownership of wealth, and in the wider sphere of world brotherhood.

EDWARD B. POLLARD.

How Do We Know? CORTLAND MEYERS, D. D., LL. D. Philadelphia: The Judson Press. 1927. Pp. 118.

THE author repudiates the implication that “science knows, but Christianity only guesses,” since “religion deals with both facts and experience.” Five questions are raised, “How do we know there is a God?” “How do we know the Bible is the Word of God?” “How do we know that Jesus is the Son of God?” “How do we know that we are children of God?” and “How do we know we shall live forever with God?” These questions

are answered in a popular manner, and in a way calculated to strengthen the weak faith of those who already believe; or of those whose skepticism is not very profound. Since so much of skepticism and infidelity is not very profound, this book has its place of service.

EDWARD B. POLLARD.

Learning Religion from Famous Americans. RALPH DORNFELD OWEN. New York: Macmillan Company. 1927. P. 273.

How best to teach religion to children is one of the vital practical questions of the day. Never was more serious thought given to its solution. Sunday-school helps issued by the various religious denominations have in recent years been widening the scope of material for religious instruction to include other personal and biographical matter than that contained in the Scriptures. Formerly these held a monopoly. Today courses upon missionary characters and other modern heroes of the faith have been offered to teachers of childhood and youth. In this volume by Professor Owen, of the Department of Education in Temple University, we have a rather unique departure from the older method. Distinguished Americans of the past and of the present are used to stimulate and inspire the religious spirit in the young. Beginning with William Bradford and ending with "Just Folks," the author has brought together facts and sayings of many different sorts of Americans, that he judged might prove inspiring. The inclusion of some who are chosen for examples, is quite as surprising as the omission of others. Ben Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, Stephen Girard appear, while Jonathan Edwards, David Brainerd, Adoniram Judson are omitted. Among Roman Catholics, Charles Carroll of Carrollton and Thomas E. Cohill appear; of Jews, David Lubin, the business man, and Joseph Krauskopf, the rabbi, are given. Among the living are Roger W. Babson, the statistician, Howard A. Kelly and W. W. Keen, the doctors; Henry VanDyke, the poet and preacher; Rufus Jones, the philosopher and mystic, and Edward A. Steiner, the Jewish Christian sociologist.

Altogether, this is an interesting experiment in teaching religion; and if the student should happen to know only what the writer of this book brings out concerning these famous Americans and what he quotes from their sayings, all may go well. A wider reading concerning some of them and their writings, and a comparison of the religious conceptions and practises of some of them with some others of them, might be quite puzzling to the youthful student. Perhaps Howard Kelly and Charles W. Eliot would be found to have little religiously in common; David Lubin, little with

Rufus Jones; and doubtless according to William Bradford's standard Benjamin Franklin had no religion at all. A youth might be confused to know that Russell H. Conwell, one of the "famous Americans" from whom one might "learn religion," was prohibited from ever entering the precincts of a college established by the will of Stephen Girard, another famous American, from whom also he is asked to learn religion. One thing is clear, teaching religion is no easy task.

EDWARD B. POLLARD.

Protestant Europe: Its Crisis and Outlook. ADOLF KELLER, D. D., LL. D., European Secretary of the Federal Council of Churches, and GEORGE STEWART, Ph. D., F. R. G. S., Minister in the Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York City. New York: George H. Doran Company. 1927. Pp. 385.

It was a happy thought to have two representative scholars, one European, the other American, collaborate in the production of this book. The result is undoubtedly something better than either could have separately produced. Both of the authors are scholars of rank, and both are also men of affairs, who have traveled widely and had large experience in the direction of religious movements. The publishers have cooperated nobly; type and presswork are of the best, and numerous maps, diagrams, and pictures effectively illustrate the text. In every way it is an excellent piece of bookmaking.

The substance is as admirable as the form. The book is divided into two parts: The first half is called "Europe's Cultural Maelstrom," while the second is devoted to "The Scope of European Protestant Churches." The title of the first part does not impress one as particularly happy; it is a survey of general conditions in Europe today, with much attention to social and economic factors, not ignoring the religious and theological. Sample chapter headings are: The Backwash of Industrialism, Continental Youth Movements, The Free Churches of Europe, The Church and Education, The Problem of Minorities. These will suffice as a hint of the interesting matters discussed, with a breadth of view and an accurate knowledge that leave nothing to be desired.

The second part is the more practically valuable, since it contributes much fresh information about matters that many of us have vainly tried hitherto to look into. There has been dearth of trustworthy facts and a superfluity of misleading propaganda in the post-war publications on all these topics. It is with joy that many will hail a book by men who are qualified to give us accurate information of the present state of religion and the various churches, as they are carrying on their work in the new conditions of Europe.

At the same time, one can recognize various shortcomings in some of these chapters. The authors appear to be acquainted with Doctor J. H. Rushbrooke's "The Baptist Movement in the Continent of Europe," for they list it in their rather miscellaneous Bibliography, but they have made too little use of it; no reader would learn from them that there are any Baptist churches in France, or Italy, or the Netherlands, or even Sweden, where the Baptist movement was one of the most notable in the past century. Yet the merits of the book so outweigh the defects that one feels like giving it the meed of unqualified praise.

HENRY C. VEDDER.